

THE POLITICAL OPINIONS

IN

THE UNITED STATES,

IN 1860 AND 1790,

IN REGARD TO THE GOVERNMENT,

THE CONSTITUTION,

NATURALIZATION & SLAVERY.

SEPTEMBER, 1862.

POLITICAL OPINIONS

IN THE

UNITED STATES.

Mr. Lincoln, during the late Administration, delivered speeches in different parts of the Union, in which he assailed the President of the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States Congress, and the Democratic party, not only did he deliver these speeches, but also approved their publication. If we are to believe Mr. Lincoln, he did this "under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger," which he believed would subvert the Constitution and destroy the liberties of the nation. Mr. Lincoln was then exercising the *right of SPEECH and of the PRESS*, guaranteed to every American citizen, *in order that he might use them for the preservation of that Constitution, the Charter of American Liberty*, by which, and for the preservation of which they were guaranteed. Did any one deny to Mr. Lincoln these rights? Did any one say that Mr. Lincoln should be imprisoned for exercising them? No. The freedom of speech, the freedom of the Press, and the Constitution of the United States were then committed to a Democratic President, in whose keeping they were respected, and the malevolent assaults and accusations of Mr. Lincoln and the Black Republican party were trumpeted throughout the land, and men who had held the highest and most honorable offices of government, men who had been honored and esteemed by great, good and wise men of the nation, and had received the approbation of the people, were villified and abused, and for what? Because their opinions and actions in conformity with their oath of office were not in accordance with the wishes and sentiments of *a minority party that has endeavored to subvert the established principles and precedents of the government*,

sanctioned during the whole preceding existence of the nation. Mr. Lincoln in 1860 was, by a minority vote, elected to the Presidency of the United States, and what has he done since his inauguration? He has suppressed the FREEDOM OF SPEECH, the FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, the WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, and the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. He has seized innocent citizens without process of law, and cast them into distant dungeons. He has retained them there without an accusation and discharged them without a reparation. And all this he has done in violation of his oath of office, and under the plea of necessity. The Constitution neither recognizes nor sanctions any such acts of necessity. It was not made for its own destruction, but for its preservation. It recognizes not the Sovereign right of a Dictator, but the Sovereign right of the People. It was made for peace, for war, for rebellion, and for the punishment of the President who violates his oath, and tramples on the Palladium of the liberties of the People.

Hear what were the warnings of Washington, who conducted the armies of the United States successfully through the wars of the Revolution, who was one of the framers of the Constitution, who *established* the government, and was truly first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen. Here his words and reflect.

"One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to *misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts.*" You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart-burnings which spring from *these misrepresentations*, they tend to render alien to each other, these who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection."

"This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, *completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers* * * * has a just claim to your confidence and your support. *Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty.*"

"All *obstructions* to the execution of the laws, all *combinations* and *associations*, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to *direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the* CONSTITUTED AUTHORITIES *are destructive to this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency.* They serve to organize faction, to give it an artful and extraordinary force, to *put in the place of the delegated will of the nation,* THE WILL OF A MINORITY, often a small but ARTFUL ENTERPRISING MINORITY of the community."

"However, combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends. They are likely, in the course of time and things, to become *potent engines, by which* CUNNING, AMBITIOUS, and UNPRINCIPLED *men will be enabled to* SUBVERT THE POWER OF THE PEOPLE AND TO USURP FOR THEMSELVES *the reins of government ;* DESTROYING AFTERWARDS THE VERY ENGINES *which have lifted them to unjust dominion."*

"Towards the *preservation of your government,* and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you RESIST WITH CARE THE SPIRIT OF INNOVATION UPON ITS PRINCIPLES, HOWEVER SPECIOUS THE PRETEXTS. One method of assault may be to effect in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will *impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown."*

"It is, indeed, *little else than a name,* where the government is *too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws,* and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property."

"The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by THE SPIRIT OF REVENGE, natural to party dissensions, which, in different ages and countries HAS PERPETRATED THE MOST HORRID ENORMITIES, IS ITSELF A FRIGHTFUL DESPOTISM. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. *The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek*

security and repose in the absolute power of an individual ; and sooner or later THE CHIEF OF SOME PREVAILING FACTION, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of HIS OWN ELEVATION, ON THE RUINS OF PUBLIC LIBERTY."

*"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. THE SPIRIT OF ENCROACHMENT TENDS TO CONSOLIDATE THE POWERS OF ALL THE DEPARTMENTS IN ONE, AND THUS TO CREATE whatever the form of government, A REAL DESPOTISM. * * ** The necessity of *reciprocal checks*, in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and *constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the other*, has been evinced by experiments, ancient and modern ; some of them in our own country and under our own eyes. *To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them.* If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modifications of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, *let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way in which the Constitution designates.* BUT LET THERE BE NO CHANGE BY USURPATION ; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good. IT IS THE CUSTOMARY WEAPON BY WHICH FREE GOVERNMENTS ARE DESTROYED. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

"It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who, that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the public."

Promote then as an object of PRIMARY IMPORTANCE, *institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.* In proportion, as the structure of a "government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

"In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations; but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate THE FURY OF PARTY SPIRIT, to warn against THE MISCHIEFS OF FOREIGN INTRIGUES, to guard against THE IMPOSTURES OF PRETENDED PATRIOTISM, this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated."

Such were the counsels of the Father of his Country, and how have they been heeded; it is, *now*, treason to tell, treason to defend the liberty which he bequeathed, treason to assail the destroyers of the Constitution, which was made for the preservation of that liberty, treason to exercise the rights of an American citizen. And who are they that *now* rule this unhappy country? The Black Republican Party, with William H. Seward and Abraham Lincoln for its leaders. And what have been the principles and policy of this party, and the doctrines of its leaders? And what are the principles and policy of the founders of this government? This is what I shall *attempt* to show in the following pages, in which I have quoted freely from Mr. Lincoln's speeches, he being the representative of the Black Republican Party.

In these quotations I have endeavored to condense what was essential, and discard what was superfluous, and in doing this I have, in some instances, been under the necessity of leaving out irrelevant intermediate substance, if in doing so there should be any injustice done to Mr. Lincoln, I disavow any intention of having made these quotations in this manner for that purpose, and hope that those who have access to Mr. Lincoln's speeches, and peruse this pamphlet, may collate the quotations with the original, and judge of their fairness and authenticity.

Mr. Lincoln, in his speech delivered at Springfield, Ill., 17th June,

1858, at the close of the Republican State Convention, which had nominated him as its candidate for United States Senator, makes use of the following:—"In my opinion, it (slavery agitation) will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. A house divided against itself cannot stand. I BELIEVE THIS GOVERNMENT CANNOT ENDURE PERMANENTLY HALF SLAVES AND HALF FREE. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. IT WILL BECOME ALL ONE THING OR ALL THE OTHER. Either the OPPONENTS OF SLAVERY WILL ARREST THE FURTHER SPREAD OF IT, and place it where the public mind shall rest, in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; OR ITS ADVOCATES WILL PUSH IT FORWARD TILL IT SHALL BECOME ALIKE LAWFUL IN ALL THE STATES, old as well as new; North as well as South." Such was Mr. Lincoln's text on that occasion, and it is his theme throughout his speeches. In order to demonstrate that the tendency of slavery was to become, nationalized and universal in the United States, he brings forward the Nebraska doctrine and Dred Scott decision, which he calls "that now *almost complete legal combination, the evidence of design and concert of action among its chief architects from the beginning.*" He says, "we cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert, but *we find it impossible not to believe that all understood one another from the beginning,* and all worked to a common plan or draft, drawn up before the first blow was struck."

These words of the Nebraska bill, viz: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Mr. Lincoln says "amounts to just this:—That if any one man chooses to enslave another no third man shall be allowed to object."

Mr. Lincoln says, "while the opinion of the court, by Chief Justice Tancy, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring Judges expressly declare that the Constitution of

the United States neither permits Congress nor the Territorial Legislature to exclude slavery from the United States Territory, they all omit to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a State or the people of a State to exclude slavery."

Mr. Lincoln says, "the nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a State over slavery is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea, and almost the language too of the Nebraska Act. On one occasion his exact language is, "except in cases where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the State is supreme over the subject of slavery within its jurisdiction." In what cases the power of the States is so restrained by the United States Constitution is left an open question, precisely as the same question as to the restraint on the power of the Territories was left open in the Nebraska Act. Put this and that together and we have another nice little niche, which we may ere long see filled with another Supreme Court decision, *declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a State to exclude slavery from its limits.*" "Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States. *Such a decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown.*" "To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty is the work now before all those who would prevent *that consummation.*"

Mr. Lincoln continues—"There are those who denounce us openly to their friends, and yet whisper softly that Senator Douglass is the aptest instrument there is with which to effect the object." "They remind us that he is a great man, and that the largest of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But a live dog is better than a dead lion. Judge Douglass, if not a dead lion for this work, is at least a caged and toothless one. How can he oppose the advance of slavery. He don't care any thing about it. His avowed mission is impressing the public heart to care nothing about it." "Our cause then must be intrusted to and conducted by *its own undoubted friends*, those who do care for the result."

“Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the *single impulse of resistance to a common danger*. * * * Of *strange discordant, and even hostile elements*, we gathered from the four winds, and formed and fought the battle.”

Such were the sentiments expressed by Mr. Lincoln at that time, when he was a candidate for United States Senator, in opposition to Mr. Douglass, when probably both of these gentlemen had an eye to the Presidency. In analyzing this speech it will be found that Mr. Lincoln was then speaking for the accomplishment of his present and prospective purposes, the Senatorship and the Presidency. His object was to establish his claims to the support of the Republican party, of strange, discordant, and even hostile elements; and to destroy the popularity, the policy, and the political prospects of his opponent, and of the party to which he belonged. Mr. Douglass was honored and esteemed by multitudes of friends in every portion of the Union. He was not a sectional man, his noble and magnanimous patriotism embraced the whole of the Republic, the champion of the equal rights of all the States, he died as he had lived, devoted to the Union and the Constitution, a patriot, a statesman, and a Democrat.

The Democratic party have controlled the Government of the United States during more than two thirds of the period of its existence. Among the Presidents elected by that party have been Jefferson and Jackson, the two most popular Presidents since the days of Washington; and, strange to say, the two most abused by the political opponents of the party to which they belonged, and the two whose authority is most often quoted by these same opponents in justification of measures, which the democracy oppose and condemn.

The foreign population or naturalized citizens of the United States have had such weight in the politics of the country that their favor has been courted by every party; and as their number and importance have increased with the increased facilities and rapidity of emigration from Europe, so has increased the obsequiousness, and

artifices of parties, to win and secure the favor of their influence. Both the *name* and *principles* of the *Democratic* party have to within a few years past been approved and supported by the naturalized population of the United States. But about the year 1854, other political elements that had previously existed, began to develop themselves in force, and artfully shaped to the circumstances of the times, produced by their effect, they won by specious appearances the approbation and support of the naturalized population. But it was not the naturalized population alone that were deluded, but thousands of native citizens, honest patriots were made the victims of artful fanatics and designing demagogues. The policy of every previous party had been based upon national principles and supported in every quarter of the Union. Mr. Clay, the embodiment of the Whig principles, was not less honored and esteemed in Pennsylvania, than in Louisiana. General Jackson, the idol of the Democracy, was not less honored and esteemed in New York, than in New Orleans, and these great men, as their not less illustrious compeer, the champion of the Constitution, Daniel Webster, knew no narrow-minded sectional prejudice but with patriotism as comprehensive as their minds, embracing the whole of their common country, lived the idolized statesmen of the nation, and dying left their illustrious deeds the imperishable monuments of their glory. But what party, and what principles have sprung into power since the departure of these luminaries of our country in the days of its pride, its power and its prosperity; this is the subject of my story.

Abolition and Republican are but different names for the same party; the former is but the extreme of the latter, the characterizing principles of each are the same, viz., hostility to slavery, the exclusion of it from all the Territories, the admission of no more slave States, and the ultimate extinction of slavery in all the States. The recognition of the social and political equality of the negro and the white man may be considered as one of the embryo principles, not yet fully developed and born, though it has assumed a form and complexion,

The constituent elements of this party is correctly described by its "standard bearer." Mr. Lincoln, in his Springfield speech of June 1858, in which he says, "two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over 1,300,000 strong. We did this under *the single impulse of resistance to common danger*, with every external circumstance against us. Of *strange discordant*, and even *hostile* elements, we gathered from the four words." Of such material is the Republican party composed : of Turners, Abolitionists, Agrarians, Radicals, Levelers, and all these notorious characters who seek notoriety in the extremes of extravagancies and eccentricities, all those austere puritanical finatics of pharisaical pretensions, all those hypocritical, false philanthropists, whose studied display of ostentatious simplicity and humility, but betray the spirit of satanic pride, and envenomed malice, such are the *strange, discordant, hostile* elements of the Black Republican party !

The Abolition party existed as early as 1789, and there is reason to believe that it existed as early as 1783, when political and religious fanatics first began to middle with the legislation of the country, and endeavor to impose their ideas of morality as a political standard for the administration of the government. But though this party has existed so long, and, notwithstanding the mischief it has done by inflammatory appeals to the passions and prejudices of the people of the North, and its mendacious and vindictive denunciation of the people of the South, its treacherous and treasonable opposition to and violation of the Constitution, and constitutional laws ; yet it has never, until recently, been able to assume any political importance in the administration of the government. There are several concurring circumstances which have recently combined to give importance and influence to this party. The long and continued agitation of the slavery question by this party, produced at last the results in the South, which it had anticipated, and the reaction of the South contributed still further to advance more rapidly the policy of the Abolitionists, who, like the cowardly assassin, provoked an assault to gratify its vindictive spirit of malice and revenge, created the evil that exists, and justified their acts by the mischief they produced, and thousands of the people without exam-

ining the origin and true cause of the evil, saw only what existed, and believed only what they saw, or were taught, under the influence of passion, to believe. Personal and private difficulties were magnified into political and public importance, a just and proper resentment of a personal affront, and punishment of a cowardly malicious vindictive vituperator, became the signal for the hostile array of adverse parties, and the vomiting of the pent up venom of the obscene vulgures of political factions was applauded as patriotism, and the foolish, wicked, and despotic spirit of malice and revenge was elevated to the dignity of statesmanship, and adopted as the policy of a government that boasts of its wisdom, its justice, and its liberty. *The mad spirit of fanaticism sent forth its midnight assassins to spread murder, rapine conflagration, and all the horrors of the unrestrained violence of a brutal and licentious bandit, through the peaceful and happy homes of an innocent and unoffending people ;* and its foolish, wicked, and guilty leader executed on the gibbet of justice was cannonized as a saint, and *songs were sung in his praise through the streets of the metropolis of the nation by the soldiers of the government, who were marching to the same field, of the exploits of their lauded, deplored and cannonized saint.*

The Democratic party has ever been the great obstacle to the Republicans in carrying out their schemes. To destroy that party has been their great aim; and the means they have resorted to accomplish this has been in keeping with the artful, intriguing, mendacious character of their conspicuous leaders, and with their own blind ignorance and infatuated credulity. The South has ever been the great ally of the Northern Democracy. The South has ever been the devoted victim of the Black Republican party; and the Northern Democracy the great preserver of the peace between these hostile sections, the barrier to the power of the Abolition party. The destruction of these two became the necessity of that party, in order to effect its purpose. If they could array all the free States against all the slave States they could then destroy the Democratic party, overwhelm the South, and carry out all their schemes. To affect this their leaders fabricated a gigantic falsehood, a monstrous

dogma, inconsistent, absurd, and incredible, save to ignorance, credulity and fanaticism.

It was taught by the leaders of the Republican party that this government could not endure half free and half slave; that it would become either all free or all slave; that either the opponents of slavery would make it all free, or the *advocates* of slavery would make it all slave; finally that the Democratic party were the *advocates* of slavery. This was the doctrine taught by the leaders of the Black Republican party, to array the Northern or free States against the Southern or slave States, and to destroy the Democratic party.

This appeal to the apprehensions of the *Northern people* in regard to the asserted designs of the Democratic party to impose the institution of slavery upon all the free States, was a *trick* of the Republicans, to rally to their party all the 'strange, discordant, and even hostile elements, under the *single impulse* of resistance to a *common danger*;" for the very idea is preposterous, contradicted by the whole course of events from the foundation of this government. The whole tendency of these events has been the very reverse of the extension of slavery. There was at the formation of this government but *one free State*. There are now nineteen free States to fifteen slave States. The total area of the United States is 3,306,834 square miles; of this area there is 1,221,457 square miles of slave territory, including the Indian territory and New Mexico, or the whole territory that there is any probability of ever becoming slave territory; leaving 2,085,377 square miles, in which there is no probability of there ever existing the institution of slavery. Moreover, the whole white population of the free States is about *twenty* millions, that of the slave States about *eight* millions. The institution of slavery could therefore never be imposed upon the free States without their consent, and if they wished it they would have it, and as they have the power to have it, if they wished it, so have they the power to exclude it, if they do not wish it. They have no desire to have it, and they never will have it, and there is *no power* that can ever impose it upon them *but themselves*. Then how absurd and how wicked this appeal to the passions and prejudices of the

people of one section of the Union to array them in hostility against the other, that has neither the intention *nor the power* to impose the institution of slavery upon any free State, but on the contrary, has just reason to believe that the number of the slave States will be lessened by the gradual and constant diminution of the number of the slaves in the border slave States, until slavery finally becomes extinct in each one of them.

The Democrats are not the advocates of slavery. They are the advocates of the rights under the Constitution, of each and every State, free as well as slave, Northern as well as Southern. The Democracy is *national*, not *sectional*; *constitutional*, not *revolutionary*; for the *enforcement* of the laws; not the *violation* of them; for the *preservation* of the Union and the Constitution, not the *destruction* of them; and when they shall rise in their united strength the majesty of the laws and the honor of the nation will be respected as in the days of Jackson, the man whom the Republicans cursed as a demon, and now praise as a demigog, the man, the Hercules, who with one hand strangled the monster Bank, and with the other, the monster Nullification. This man, who was cursed from Main to Georgia, was the embodiment of Democratic principles, the true type of the Democratic party. He knew no country but the Union; no guide but the Constitution; no motive but his duty; and knowing these he disregarded the curses, and clamours of parties, the eulogies of friends, the denunciation of enemies, and boldly assuming the responsibility of his acts, discharged his duties as a patriot, a statesman, and a hero.

According to the Republican leaders the Democrats are to push slavery forward until it becomes alike lawful in all the States, while the Republicans are to extinguish it. This wonderful discovery of the design of the Democratic party is of comparatively recent date, since the defeat of Mr. Fremont, as a Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1856. It is wonderful that the wisdom and sagacity, if not the envy and malice of the Republican party had not earlier detected and disclosed this design of the Democracy to transport the slaves from the Southern to the Northern States, or to re-open the African slave trade, expressly to supply the Northern States

with negro slaves, in order to convert them into slave States. Not only to convert them into slave States, but after they had thus been saddled with slavery to actually prohibit them from abolishing it ! Such are the teachings of the Black Republican party. There is nothing too absurd for its leaders to assert, or too incredulous for its followers to believe.

Mr. Lincoln begins with the Republican hobby, slavery, and to strengthen the "single impulse of resistance to a common danger," boldly asserts that "the advocate of slavery will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States," while he *modestly* asserts that the moderation of the opponents of slavery will only "arrest the further spread of it;" thus contrasting the violence of the one party to carry slavery forceably into every State of the Union, with the Republican moderation to confine it to its present limits.

What does this appeal to the passions, the prejudices, the fears, and the credulity of the Northern people amount to ? Hear him ! "All the States have the right to do exactly as they please about all their domestic relations, including that of slavery." "*I hold myself under constitutional obligations to allow the people of all the States without interference, directly or indirectly, to do exactly as they please.*" "I do not understand that there is any place where an alteration of the social and political relation of the negro and the white man can be made, except in the State Legislature, not in the Congress of the United States." Hear him again and mark it. "The Judge (Douglass) alludes *very often*, in the course of his remarks, to the exclusive right which the States have to decide the whole thing (slavery) for themselves. I agree with him *very readily*, that the different States have that right. He is but fighting a man of straw, when he assumes that I am contending against the right of the States, to do as they please about it (slavery). Our controversy with him is in regard to the new territories. *We agree, when the States come in as States, they have the right and the power to do as they please. We have no power, as citizens of the free States or in our federal capacity, as members of the Federal Union, through*

the general government, to disturb slavery in the States where it exists." "I will say here, while upon this subject, that *I have no purpose directly or indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so."*

In each of these five quotations Mr. Lincoln recognizes the right of the States, where slavery exists, to do with it as they please. In two he acknowledges the exclusive right of these States on the subject. In one he acknowledges that there is no constitutional right, in another that he has no lawful right to interfere with slavery where it exists. In one he asserts that he has no purpose, directly or indirectly, and no inclination to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists. In one he agrees that a territory, when it comes into the Union as a State, has the right and the power to do with slavery as it pleases. Finally, he reduces the contest to a controversy, in regard to *new territories*. Yet, notwithstanding all these admissions, notwithstanding his accord with Mr. Douglass, in regard to the exclusive jurisdiction of the States, where it exists, in regard to slavery, he asserts that the policy of the Democratic party is to nationalize slavery and make it alike lawful in all the States.

He says the controversy in regard to slavery springs from the difference of opinion between the men who think slavery a wrong, and those who do not think it a wrong. "The Republican party think it is a wrong—we think it is a moral, a social, and a political wrong. We think it is a wrong not confirming itself merely to the persons or the States where it exists, but that it is a wrong in its tendency, to say the least, that extends itself to the existence of the whole nation." I will say now that there is *a sentiment* in the country *contrary to me*, and that sentiment is the Democratic sentiment. Thus, it appears from Mr. Lincoln's own showing, that he intends the Democratic party as the opponent of Republicanism, and the advocate of universal slavery. The ideas which he advances to prove the intention of the Democratic party to nationalize slavery are the most absurd that any ordinary politician has ever attempted to impose upon the common sense, and

credulity of the most prejudiced, infatuated, fanatical, and gullible people.

He says:—"Let any one who doubts carefully contemplate that now *almost complete legal combination*—piece of machinery, so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine, and the Dred Scott decision, the evidences of *design and concert of action, among its chief architects from the beginning.*" He proceeds to mention the *three points* in this great conspiracy—the first was the enacting of the *Nebraska bill*. "This opened all the national territory to slavery and was the *first point gained.*" "But so far *Congress* only had acted, and an endorsement by the *people* was indispensable." "The election came, Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the endorsement secured, that was the *second point gained.*" "The *several points* of the *Dred Scott* decision, in connection with *Senator Douglass' policy*, was the *third point gained.*" These several points in the Dred Scott decision are—"First. That no slave imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave can ever be a citizen of any State in the sense of that term used in the Constitution of the United States." Mr. Lincoln remarks:—"This point was made to *deprive* the negro of the benefit of that provision of the Constitution which declares—"The *citizen* of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States." "Secondly. That subject to the Constitution of the United States, neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory. This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property." "Thirdly. That whether the holding of a negro in actual slavery in a free State makes him free, as against the holder, the United States court will not decide, but will leave it to be decided by the courts of any slave State, the negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made not to be pressed immediately, but if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently *endorsed by the people at an election.*" "Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine is to educate and mould public opinion, at least Northern public

opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or up." Such is the machinery, the main and subordinate parts of an awful conspiracy! which, though designed "from the beginning," it was permitted only to the genius of Mr. Lincoln to discover, who tells not only what has been, and is, but also what is to be, and even the *motives* of the Chief Justice of the United States in delivering his opinion.

The Supreme Court, the Senate, the House of Representatives, the President and the People, according to Mr. Lincoln's own showing all from parts of the "piece of machinery," with its evidences of design and concert of action among its chief architects from the beginning.

Mr. Lincoln states the questions and decisions in his own *peculiar* way, the language of the Supreme Court must not be confounded with his, which states the questions and decisions to suit his purpose. He says:—"If I were in Congress and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should. We let this property abide by that decision, but we will try to reverse that decision. It is based upon falsehood in the main as to facts—allegations of facts upon which it stands are not facts at all, in many instances, and no decision made on any question thus placed—the first instance of a decision made under so many unfavorable circumstances has ever been held by the profession as law, and it has always needed confirmation before the lawyers regard it as settled law." Now, Mr. Lincoln does not consider himself bound by that decision, except to "let *this property* abide by that decision," which "*is based upon falsehoods*," "*allegations of facts, upon which it stands, are not facts at all*," it is *not law*, it is *not settled law*. Then of what validity is the decision beyond the individual property to which it related? Mr. Lincoln will tell you. Listen. "The essence of the Dred Scott case is compressed into the sentence, viz:—"The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution." I believe that the Supreme Court and the advocates of that decision may search in vain for a place in

the Constitution, where the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed, I say, *therefore*, that *I think one* of the premises is not true in fact." "As the Democrats believe that decision to be correct, and that the extension of slavery is affirmed in the National Constitution, they are bound to support it as such. Judge Douglass understands the Constitution according to the Dred Scott decision, and he is bound to support it as he understands it. I understand it in another way, and therefore I am bound to support it in the way in which I understand it." Mr. Lincoln to sanction what he advances, says:—"General Jackson once said each man was bound to support the Constitution as he understood it." Thus Mr. Lincoln disposes of the validity and obligation of the Dred Scott decision in this instance. Each individual is to decide upon the correctness of each judicial decision, and each legislative act, and be bound by them only to the extent of the conviction of his own judgment, of their legality, or constitutionality; and further, that decision according to Mr. Lincoln, "is based upon falsehood, allegation of facts, upon which it stands, are not facts at all," and why? Mr. Lincoln tells you, "I believe, therefore, I think *one* of the premises is not true in fact." This may be a very convincing argument with Republicans and Abolitionists, who believe in the infallibility of Mr. Lincoln. But I want something more potent than Mr. Lincoln's *belief* and *assertion* to convince me of the corruption of the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, hear Mr. Lincoln on the other side. He says:—"I spoke of the Dred Scott decision in my Springfield speech, and *I was endeavoring to prove that the Dred Scott decision was a portion of a system to make slavery national* in this country. I pointed out what *things had been decided by the Court*. I mentioned as a fact that *they had decided* that a negro could not be a citizen, that they had done so, as *I supposed*, to *deprive* the negro, under all circumstances of the remotest possibility of *ever becoming* a citizen, and claiming the rights of a citizen of the United States, under a certain clause of the Constitution, *I stated that without making any complaint of it at all*. I then went on and stated the other *points decided in the case*; namely, that the bring-

ing of a negro into the State of Illinois, and holding him in slavery for two years there, was a matter in regard to which they would not decide, whether it would make him free or not ; that they decided the further point, that taking him into a United States territory, where slavery was prohibited by Act of Congress, did not make him free, because that Act of Congress they held was unconstitutional. I mention these *three things* as making up the *points decided* in that case." Mr. Lincoln must hold either that negroes are, or are not citizens of the United States; if the former then, the negro is his political equal; if the latter, then the negro could not be *deprived* of that which he never possessed. Mr. Lincoln says he does not make "*any complaint*" in stating one of the *several points* of the Dred Scott decision, and that one of the *working points* in this awful conspiracy. Mr. Lincoln is not "making any complaint at all !"

In regard to the second point, the exclusion of slavery from the territory by Congress or the Territorial Legislature, which Mr. Lincoln enumerates among the working points of this "legal combination," he says:—"I know that in his (Douglass') speech at Springfield, he spoke of it as a thing they had not decided yet, and in his answer to me at Freeport, he spoke of it, so far again as I can comprehend it, as a thing that *had not yet been decided*. I think that *he is not mistaken*, in so far as it can be said, that the Court has not decided any thing save the *mere question of jurisdiction*. If any points are really *extra, judicially decided*, then this one, as to the *power of the Territorial Legislature to exclude slavery* is one of them, as also the one that the *Missouri compromise was null and void*. They are both *extra judicial*, or neither is, according as the Court held that they had no jurisdiction in the case between the parties, because of want of capacity of one party to maintain a suit in that Court. I want, if I have sufficient time to show that the Court did *pass its opinion*, but that is the *only thing actually done in the case*." Mr. Lincoln is as dexterous at his *logical* tricks as Heller or Herrmann at Legerdemain. He can in his *peculiar way* prove that a decision has been made, and then prove that it has not been

made. An extra judicial decision, according to Lord Mansfield, is not a "determination of the Court," "is no adjudication."

Mr. Lincoln has almost an exalted opinion of the integrity and wisdom of the Supreme Court of the United States, as the people of the United States has of his genius and statesmanship. He says :—"It is *my opinion* that the Dred Scott decision, as it is, never would have been made in its present form, if *the party* that made it had not been sustained previously by *the election*. *My opinion* is that *the new* Dred Scott decision against the right of the people of States will never be made if *that party* is not sustained by *the elections*. I believe further that it is *just as sure to be made as to-morrow is to come*, if *that party* shall be sustained. The course of argument that Judge Douglass makes use of upon this subject is preparing the public mind for that *new* Dred Scott decision." It must be remembered that Mr. Lincoln is *electioneering*, is *stumping* the State of Illinois, is a candidate in opposition to Mr. Douglass for the *Senatorship*, in Congress, of that State; that he has the *Presidency* in prospect; that he is endeavoring to arouse "the *single impulse of resistance to a common danger*" to rally the Republicans, "of *strange, discordant*, and even *hostile* elements," "gathered from the four winds," to fight *his* battle; all this must be recollected, remembered, kept in view, in pursuing the sinuous, labyrinth to the dark recess of his secret motives.

The absurdity of Mr. Lincoln stating points, as decided as evidence of a "legal combination," "design concert of action" to carry out a grand scheme of conspiracy to make slavery national, and prohibit the States and Territories from excluding it, which "is the subject of *his* story," if not of his complaint, and then saying "I stated that without making any complaint of it at all" is easily explained. The Supreme Court, according to Mr. Lincoln, had decided that the negro was not a citizen of the United States. This would be a good bait for the Abolitionists—this would raise a howl against the violation of the principle of the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are *created* equal"—"liberty, fraternity, and equality" had served as a good watch word to rally the popu-

lace in the bloody revolutions of France, it might serve in a like manner in the approaching struggle to rally the populace, the "strange, discordant, hostile *elements*," from the "four winds," under the black banner of Republicanism, that was the object of the *statement* of the point.

He did not make "any complaint of it at all." Why should he complain of it? *The decision of the Court was in accordance with his own sentiments.* If it was not constitutional it ought to have been, and *virtually* was, in as much as the denying to the negro of the rights of citizenship, *by the people of the United States*, is a fact as firmly established as if it had been made so by an amendment of the Constitution, declaring that negroes are not citizens. The Missouri compromise, the great hobby of the Whig party, the Quondum party of Mr. Lincoln, the Missouri compromise made in violation of the Constitution, converting a congressional act into a constitutional amendment, had not a tithe of the claim to the acquiescence of the citizens of the United States, that has this opinion of the Supreme Court, sanctioned by the universal custom of the people. The exclusion of the negro from all the privileges and immunities of a citizen of the United States, ought to be sufficient to establish that as law, which universal custom has sanctioned for a century, especially ought it to be so, when the right of citizenship is based upon a political equality, for which the negro is physically disqualified by reason of the inferiority of his organization, which qualifies him only for the social and political equality of the race to which he belongs.

Mr. Lincoln has said that he is the standard bearer of the Republican party, then let this representative, embodiment of Republican principles, speak with authority in behalf of his party. Hear what he says of negro equality:—"I *think* I would not hold one (negro) in slavery at any rate; yet the point is not clear enough for me to denounce people upon. What next? Free them, and make them politically and socially our equals? *My feelings would not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know* that those of *the great mass of the white people will not.* A universal feeling cannot be safely disregarded. *We cannot then make them equals.*" Mr.

Lincoln does not think the *point* clear enough for him to denounce people upon. He does not denounce any body, no not he. He only says slavery is a "*moral evil*," a *violation of the plain principles of justice and rectitude, a crime*; an offense against the laws of right prescribed by God and man. Mr. Lincoln proceeds:—"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a *physical difference* between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably *forever forbid* their living together upon a footing of perfect equality, and in as much as *it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference*. I am in favor of the race to which I belong, having the *superior position*. I have never said anything to the contrary." O, no, Mr. Lincoln has *never said* anything to the contrary. But horrible! "all men are *created equal*," so says the Declaration of Independence, and the Supreme Court has decided that negroes are not citizens, and therefore the negro has not "the right to eat the bread without the leave of any body else, which his own hand *earns*," to which small dimensions and humble condition Mr. Lincoln reduces, "all men are created equal," and "the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Mr. Lincoln, in his Quincy speech, says:—"At our first meeting at Ottawa, I read an extract from an old speech of mine, in which extract I expressly declared that my own feelings would not admit a social and political equality between the white and black races, and that even if my own feelings would admit it, I still knew that the *public sentiment of the country would not*, and that such a thing was an *utter impossibility*. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races." Mr. Lincoln, in his Columbia speech, expresses himself more emphatically on this subject. He says:—"I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about *in any way* the social and political equality of the white and black races, that I am not, or ever have been in favor of making *voters or jurors* of negroes, *nor of qualifying them to hold office*, or intermarry with the white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a *physical difference* between

the white and black races, which I believe *will forever forbid* the two races from living together upon terms of social and political equality. I will add to this, that *I have never seen*, to my knowledge, *a man, woman or child*, who was in favor of producing perfect equality, social and political, between negroes and white men." Mr. Lincoln, in his Charleston speech, says:—"I am not in favor of negro citizenship. *My opinion* is that *the different States have the power* to make a negro a citizen under the Constitution of the United States if they choose. The Dred Scott decision decides that they have not that power. *If the State of Illinois had that power*, I should be opposed to the exercise of it." Who shall decide when *doctors* disagree?

Notwithstanding all that Mr. Lincoln has said in the above quotations of the *inequality* of the white and black races, and of the *inferiority* of the negro race, and of his assigning an *inferior position* to the negro race, he in his own classical language, "kicks his fat into the fire." He says:—"These arguments that are made, that the inferior races are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that Kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of king-craft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, and that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. I should like to know if taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that *all men are equal* upon principle, and *making exception to it*, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? I have only to say let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race, that race, and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position—*discarding our standard that we have left us*. Let us *discard all these things*, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up and declare that *all men are created equal*. I leave you, hoping that

the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that *all men are created free and equal.*"

The avowed policy of the Republican party *was* to exclude slavery from all the territories of the United States, to acquire no more slave territory, to admit no more slave states, and to restrict slavery to the States where it exists. Such was, until lately, the avowed policy of the Republican party—the principles upon which that party has risen into power, though they violate the compact between Texas and the United States, by which Texas was admitted into the Union. The Republicans saw that, in order to accomplish their avowed purposes, it was necessary to establish certain propositions as truths. These propositions are, that slavery is a moral, a social and a political evil; that slavery is not recognized in the Constitution of the United States; that slaves are not property; that the words of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal," includes the negro. Now, in regard to the first of these propositions, it was only necessary to prove that slavery was a moral evil, in order to demonstrate that it was also a social and political one. So the Republicans struck at the very foundation, in order to overthrow the whole edifice, and proclaimed their fiat to the people in the following words:—"We think it is a moral, a social and a political wrong; *we think it is a wrong, not confining itself merely to the persons or the States where it exists, but that it is a wrong in its tendency, to say the least, THAT EXTENDS ITSELF TO THE EXISTENCE OF THE WHOLE NATION.*" What is a moral evil? A violation of the plain principles of justice and rectitude—A CRIME; AN OFFENCE AGAINST THE LAWS OF RIGHT, PRESCRIBED BY GOD AND MAN. Such was the decree of the Black Republicans against the institution of slavery. Pamphlets, speeches and books, disparaging southern men, southern society, southern institutions, were freely and extensively disseminated among the population of the North; and itinerant lecturers sent to fan and feed the flame of envy, hatred and malice, and all uncharitableness; emissaries were sent South, in the guise of teachers, and governesses to sneak into the sanctuary of the domestic circle, violate the laws of hospitality, and serpent-like, sting the bosom that

had sheltered them. Even the pulpit, consecrated to the worship of the God of truth and love, was converted into a political rostrum, whence blasphemy and infidelity propagated the infernal principles that were to sap the foundations of society, sever the Union, and subvert our laws, our liberty and our Constitution. And Mr. Lincoln complacently asks, "Does not this question make a disturbance outside of political circles? Does it not enter into the churches and rend them asunder? What divided the *great* Methodist church into two parties, North and South? What has raised this constant disturbance in every Presbyterian General Assembly that meets? What disturbed the Unitarian church in this very city (Cincinnati) two years ago? What has jarred and shaken the great American Tract Society recently, not yet splitting it, but sure to divide it in the end? Is it not this mighty deep seated power that *somehow* operates on the minds of men, exciting and stirring them up in every avenue of society—in *politics*, in *religion*, in *literature*, in *morals*, in all the manifold relations of life." Thus have the Black Republicans affected, to a fatal extent, their iniquitous purposes, by "OPERATING ON THE MINDS OF MEN, EXCITING AND STIRRING THEM UP IN EVERY AVENUE OF SOCIETY—IN ALL THE MANIFOLD RELATIONS OF LIFE."

The second and third proposition, viz: That slaves are not recognized in the Constitution, and that slaves are not property, are both made to deprive citizens of slave States, holding such property, of their Constitutional rights in the territories, and thus exclude slaves from the territories. The equality of the States and of the citizens of the States; and the rights of the States and the citizens of the States are recognized in the Constitution, which says, "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another." "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of *any law or regulation therein*, be discharged from such service or labor." "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and

make all *needful* rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Mr. Lincoln's sophistry on this subject is worthy of transcribing as a specimen of the logical powers of the embodiment of the Republican party and principles in the present incumbent of the seat that has been graced and honored by the wisdom and patriotism of a Washington, a Madison, a Jefferson, and a Jackson. Mr. Lincoln says:—"The essence of the Dred Scott decision is compressed into the sentence:—'The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution.' What is it to be affirmed in the Constitution? Made firm in the Constitution—so made that it cannot be separated from the Constitution without breaking the Constitution—durable as the Constitution, and part of the Constitution. Now remember the provision of the Constitution, which I have read, affirming that THAT INSTRUMENT IS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND; that the Judges of every State shall be bound by it, any law or Constitution of any State to the contrary, notwithstanding! that the right of property in a slave is affirmed in that Constitution, is made, formed into, and cannot be separated from it without breaking it, durable as the instrument, part of the instrument, what follows as a short and even sylogestic argument from it? I think it follows, and I submit to the consideration of men capable of arguing, whether, as I state it, in sylogestic form, the argument has any fault in it."

"Nothing in the Constitution, or law of any State, can destroy a right distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution of the United States."

"The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution of the United States."

"Therefore, nothing in the Constitution, or laws of any State, can destroy the right of property in a slave."

Thus does Mr. Lincoln demonstrate that the opinion pushed to its "logical conclusion" prohibits the States from excluding slavery.

But Mr. Lincoln says:—"There is a fault in it (the opinion) as I think, but the fault is not in the *reasoning*, but the *falsehood*, in fact is a fault of the premises. *I believe* that the right of property in a slave is not distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution. *I believe* that the Supreme Court and the advocates of that decision may search in vain for a place in the Constitution, where the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed. I say, *therefore*, that *I think* one of the premises is not true in fact."

But Mr. Lincoln says:—"I am somewhat acquainted with the Old Line Whigs." "I was with the Old Line Whigs from the origin to the end of that party. I became pretty well acquainted with them, and I knew they always had some sense." I guess we are surrounded to some extent to-day by the old friends of Mr. Clay, and they will be glad to hear any thing from *that authority*." Well, what is *that authority*, on the subject of the *legality of slavery being recognized in the Constitution*? Mr. Clay says:—"He is speaking of the principles of equality in the Declaration of Independence." "Do you believe that, in making that Declaration, the States that concurred in it intended that it should be tortured into a virtual emancipation of all the slaves within their respective limits? Would Virginia and other Southern States have ever united in a Declaration, which was to be interpreted into an abolition of slavery among them? Did any one of the thirteen colonies entertain such a *design* or *expectation*? To impute such a secret and unavowed purpose, would be to charge a political *fraud upon the noblest hand of patriots* that ever assembled in council—a *fraud upon the Confederacy of the Revolution*—a *fraud upon the Union* of those States, whose Constitution not only recognized the lawfulness of slavery, but permitted the importation of slaves from Africa until the year 1808."

The fallacious reasoning of Mr. Lincoln is so apparent throughout his speeches, that a discerning mind is not at a loss to detect his motives. The following is an illustration of the unlimited assertions of Mr. Lincoln: he says "*I believe the entire records of the world* (!) from the date of the Declaration of Independence up to within three years ago, may be searched in vain for one single affirmation, from

one single man, that the negro was not included in the Declaration of Independence. *I think I may defy Judge Douglas to show that he ever said so, that Washington ever said so, that any President ever said so, that any Member of Congress ever said so, or any living man upon the whole earth ever said so, until the necessity of the present policy of the Democratic party, in regard to slavery, had to invent that affirmation.*" Look upon that picture and then upon this. At Galesburg the other day, I said, in answer to Judge Douglass, that three years ago there never had been a man, so far as *I knew or believed*, in the whole world who had said that the Declaration of Independence did not include negroes in the term "all men." I re-assert it to-day. I assert that Judge Douglass and all his friends may search the *whole records of the country*, and it will be a matter of great astonishment to me, if they shall be able to find that *one human being*, three years ago, had ever uttered the astounding sentiment that the term "all men" in the Declaration of Independence did not include the negro. *Do not let me be misunderstood. I know that more than three years ago there were men, who, finding this assertion constantly in the way of their schemes to bring about the ascendancy and perpetuation of Slavery, denied the truth of it. I know that Mr. Calhoun and all the politicians of his school denied the truth of the Declaration of Independence. I know that it ran along in the mouths of some Southern men for a period of years, ending at last in that shameful, though rather forcible declaration of Pettit of Indiana upon the floor of the United States Senate, that the Declaration of Independence was, in that respect, a self-evident lie, rather than a self-evident truth. But I say, with a perfect knowledge of all this hawking at the Declaration, without directly attacking it, that three years ago there never had lived a man who had ventured to assail it in the sneaking way, of pretending to believe it and then asserting that it did not include the negro. I believe the first man who ever said it, was Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the next to him was our friend, Stephen A. Douglass. "Such are the evidences of Mr. Lincoln's logical powers—or rather of his sophistry and chicanery. It is,*

"I believe", "*I think*" "*therefore I say,*" and sweeping assertions, embracing the *world* and *all mankind*.

At the time of the Declaration of Independence, monarchical institutions existed in almost every nation in Europe, variously modified from absolute despotism to constitutional monarchy; Kings, Princes, and Nobles held the highest offices by hereditary right, and chiefly constituted the government—a government that had been established by force or fraud, and sanctioned by custom or power. At the period of the settlement of the North American Colonies, the monstrous doctrine of the *divine right of Kings* had been asserted and advocated. "It was gravely maintained that the Supreme Being regarded hereditary monarchy, as opposed to other forms of Government, with peculiar favor; that the rules of succession, in order of primogeniture, was a Divine Institution; that no human power could deprive the legitimate Prince of his rights; that the laws by which the prerogative was limited, were to be regarded merely as concessions which the sovereign had freely made, and might at his pleasure resume; and that any treaty into which a King might enter with his people, was merely a declaration of his present intentions, and not a contract of which the performance could be demanded. The populace of Europe had held for ages the condition of serfs, slaves, and had been taught that implicit obedience to the powers that were, was a Christians duty. Such was, or had been the state of Europe, hence, refugees from the power of their oppressors had peopled the Colonies of North America. Having become comparatively numerous and powerful, the people of the Colonies resolved to establish an Independent Government, based upon what they believed to be the fundamental principles of human rights. The Declaration of Independence, embodying these principles, was presented to the assembled Delegates of the thirteen Colonies, who declared them to the world, pledging for their support under Divine Providence, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The following, from the Declaration of Independence, is the spirit of that instrument, viz: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their

Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; and *that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them (mankind) under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.* Such are the political doctrines promulgated by the Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July 1776, when 3,000,000 of British subjects severed the political ties that bound them to the British Empire.

The Declaration that all men are created equal, relates only to the natural condition of man in which all men are equal; no one is created to a condition superior to that of another. The inequalities in the conditions of men are produced by human laws and the development of the superior endowments of individuals. They were created with these endowments, and in this respect, one man is created superior to another; but the Declaration of Independence has reference only to the natural condition of man, in which all men are created equal. Mr. Lincoln and Sambo, both came into the world without either having any privilege or immunity over the other, in the natural condition to which they, in common with all created humanity were born. But Mr. Lincoln and Sambo were very unequally endowed; the development of the endowments of the one has raised him from *the original level* to the pinnacle of political power, while poor Sambo, constituting the tale end of humanity, has, in common with the *subjugated citizens* of the United States, the *theoretical right* to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The principle that all men are created equal is true, in regard to the natural condition of man; that of governments, deriving their

just powers from the consent of the governed is good in theory, but false in fact; it is contradicted by nearly the whole record of the human race; force or fraud has been the foundation of almost every government that has existed; it asserts, not what is, or has been, but *what should be in an intelligent civilized community*. No enlightened man could ever believe that these principles of government were ever intended to be applied to Caffirs, Hottentots, or Negroes. None but a Black Republican or an Abolitionist could believe this.

How the equality set forth in the Declaration of Independence could aid in either bringing about or in defeating "the ascendancy and perpetuation of slavery," I am unable to perceive; but from the persistency of the Abolitionists and Black Republicans in perpetually associating it with the negro, one might infer that they believed that there was some great and extraordinary virtue in it, which would convert the negro into a white man and abolish slavery throughout the land.

Mr. Lincoln so often refers to the principle of equality and the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, in connection with the negro, that one ignorant of the purpose and principles of the Declaration of Independence might reasonably infer that that instrument was expressly made in reference to the Independence of the negro. General rules and general principles are the foundation of all governments, religions, societies and systems; broad, general, universal in their extent; then come the particular principles, the practicable, expedient, taught by experience and sanctioned by usage and custom. Have all men an *inalienable* right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, a right of which they can neither divest themselves nor be divested? Are not men deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, even by the law itself, which was made for their protection? This may seem very inconsistent, but it is a just illustration of the great fundamental principles, and the particular principles by which they are modified and controlled under particular circumstances. And what is liberty? Is it vice and virtue placed upon the same equality, with unrestrained powers of

action? No; liberty, real liberty, is virtuous action unrestrained, protected by laws that restrain and control vicious action. Or to good the greatest, and to evil the least possible limit, consistent with the general welfare, such is political liberty, or the liberty enjoyed in civilized communities. As good and evil are mingled in the constitution of each individual, it necessarily follows the wise restraint upon the powers of human action is the foundation of political liberty. The extent of the restraint must be determined by the race or community, whose liberty is to be secure; and to ensure liberty and political equality to the community, it must be impartial and universal, but applicable only to the distinct race, for only the members of an individual race are qualified, by their physical organization, for that liberty and equality, which is best adapted to secure the greatest good to that race. But how is a nation to act which has within it a race inferior and entirely distinct? Shall the war steed stop for the donkey, and the eagle for the owl? Or shall the laws of God and nature, indelible, and unmistakable, be regarded—laws that have formed the human family into various distinct races, which under their irresistible influence, have formed separate and distinct communities, to which alone the great principles of liberty and political equality are applicable.

Mr. Lincoln has appealed to the passions, the prejudices, and the fears of the Northern People. He has either insulted their intelligence, or displayed a degree of ignorance in regard to the history, the policy and the principles of the Government, which is surprising in one whose artful ambition, under the guise of modesty and humility, has inspired him, encouraged by a deluded people and an infatuated party, to aspire to the Chief Magistracy of a nation that has *hitherto* been honored for its wisdom and its glory, respected for its power and its prowess, and envied for its wealth, its prosperity and its happiness—not under Abolition, not under Free Soil, not under Black Republican rule, but under the auspices of the *Great National Democratic Principles*, sustained by the greatest number of the greatest men that the Republic has produced, who, under their benign influence *have administered the National Government*

more than TWO of the THREE QUARTERS of a century of its existence, who have illustrated its civil and its military career with the brightest names that have adorned the pages of its history.

What is more absurd, inconsistent with the whole record of the country, than the statement of Mr. Lincoln, that it was the object of the Democratic party to nationalize slavery, to make slavery lawful in all the States, and prohibit them from abolishing it? There was, at the formation of this government, but *one* free State; there are now *nineteen* free States to *fifteen* slave States. But in the number of slave States, there are two merely nominally so, viz: Maryland, which has but 87,188 slaves to a population of 500,000 free persons; and Delaware, which has but 1,798 slaves to a population of 90,000 free persons.

The total area of the United States is 3,306,834 square miles; of this area, there is, including the Indian territory and New Mexico, 1,221,457 square miles of slave territory; leaving 2,085,377 square miles, in which there is no probability of there ever existing the Institution of Slavery. The whole course of events since the formation of this government, has been the consolidation of slavery, and the expansion of freedom. The operation of the increase of the population of the free States was destined to act upon the slave States as soon as the States north of the Ohio River should become comparatively densely populated. The occupation of the lands north of the Ohio, the remoteness of the public lands, the increase of native population, and of the influx of foreign population on the one hand; the waste and desertion of lands in some of the border slave States, the large area of unoccupied lands in these states, the emigration from these States to the rich cotton lands of the South, the high price of cotton which stimulated emigration to the South, and enhanced the value of slaves, so as to make it more profitable to employ them in the cultivation of sugar and cotton, or to sell them for that purpose rather than to keep them in a border State, exposed to the machinations of abolition emissaries on the other hand, indicated that the "irrepressible" but *peaceful* conflict would be the advance and increase of free States and free population, and the

retrogression and consolidation of slavery, and necessarily diminution of slave States until the whole slave territory and population would be confined to the States south of the thirty-fifth parallel, or to the Gulf States, South Carolina, Arkansas, and the Indian Territory, or to nine States, or an area of 737,596 square miles, leaving 2,569,238 square miles of free territory. The effects of this operation is plainly perceptible in every border State from Delaware to Missouri. But the Black Republican party were not satisfied with this, they must get up the "single impulse of resistance to a common danger" and array all the free States against all the slave States, *to carry out their own iniquitous schemes.*

The votes of the United States in 1856, were :

Northern Votes..... 2,058,958

Southern Votes..... 1,090,246

The population of the United States in 1850, was :

Northern Population..... 13,598,734

Southern Population..... 9,658,238

Of the Southern population 3,200,000 were *slaves*.

The present population of the United States is about as follows :

Northern Population..... 19,530,000

Southern Population 11,870,000

Of the Southern population about 4,000,000 are *slaves*. Finally, there are *five free States* whose representation in Congress is *greater* than that of *all the Southern States*, and yet the people are taught by the Black Republicans that the advocates of slavery are going to make slavery lawful in all the States and prohibit them from abolishing it!

What is more indicative of the monomania of the Black Republican party on the subject of slavery, and of their perverted minds, than the following language of the Republican Standard Bearer. He, Mr. Lincoln, says, "I am not unaware that *this government* has endured eighty-two years, half slave and half free. "*I know that.*" *I believe* it has endured, because during *all that time* until the introduction of the Nebraska Bill, *the public mind* did rest *all the time* in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. That

was what gave us the rest that we had through the period of eighty two years, at least so *I believe*. I have *always* hated slavery, I think, as much as an Abolitionist. I have been an Old Line Whig. I have *always* hated it, but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska Bill began. I *always believed* that *everybody* was against it and that it was in course of ultimate extinction. The *great men of the nation* have rested in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. "They had reason to believe so."

"The adoption of the Constitution and *its attendant history* lead the people to believe so; and such was the belief of the framers of the Constitution itself, why did these old men about the time of the adoption of the Constitution declare that slavery should not go into the new Territory where it had not already gone? Why declare that within twenty years the African Slave Trade, by which slaves are supplied, might be cut off by Congress? What were they but a clear indication, that the framers of the Constitution intended and expected the ultimate extinction of that institution? And now when I say that *I think* the opponents of slavery will resist the further speed of it and place it where the public mind shall rest, with the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction. I only mean to say that they will place it *where the founders of this government originally placed it*."

Mr. Lincoln says :—"I always believed that every body was against it (slavery) and that it was in course of ultimate extinction. The great mass of the nation have rested in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction." Now, Mr. Lincoln accuses the Democratic party of a conspiracy to make slavery lawful in all the States, and prohibiting them from abolishing it; then surely this party, according to him, cannot be against slavery; and yet he says :—"I always believed that every body was against it." Perhaps he thinks the Democrats are nobody. But here is the record of the Democratic party.

DEMOCRATIC TERMS.	DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTS.
1801	Jefferson.
1805	do
1809	Madison.
1813	do
1817	Monroe.
1821	do
1829	Jackson.
1833	do
1837	VanBuren.
1845	Polk.
1853	Pierce.
1857	Buchanan.

Washington was inaugurated the *first* President of the United States, under the *present* Constitution, April 30th, 1789, from that date to 1860, a period of 72 years, there have been 18 regular Presidential Terms, and of these there have been 12 Democratic, amounting to 48 years or two-thirds of the existence of the Constitutional Government of the United States. Or within that period there have been 13 regular Presidents, of whom 8 have been Democrats, who have administered the Government during two-thirds of its existence. They have administered it during the most critical periods of its existence. They have carried it successively through two wars, and added more than 2,000,000 of square miles to the public domain, thus increasing the area of the United States to quadruple its original dimensions.

Mr. Lincoln has said that while the public mind rested in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction there was peace on that subject, and he says that the public mind did rest in that belief until the introduction of the Nebraska Bill. Then, according to Mr. Lincoln, there was peace on that subject up to that time. But how is this to be reconciled with the following words of Mr. Lincoln:—"This slavery element is a durable element of discord among us, and we shall probably not have perfect peace in this country with it, until it either masters the free principles of our govern-

ment, or is so far mastered by the free principle as for the public mind to rest in the belief that it is going to its end." "*We all know that it (slavery agitation) has continued with more or less violence ever since the revolution.*"

Mr. Lincoln says:—"From the adoption of the Constitution, down to 1820, is the precise period of our history, when we had comparative peace upon this question (slavery.) Then it would be worth our while to stop and examine into the probable reason of our coming nearer to having peace then than at any other time." Here follows his reason. He says:—"This was *the precise period of time in which our fathers adopted, and during which they followed a policy, restricting the spread of slavery, and the whole Union was acquiescing in it.*"

The Constitution was "adopted" in 1789, from that year to 1820 is a period of 30 years, during which Mr. Lincoln says our fathers adopted and followed "a policy." That is true, but it was not a policy either *restricting or extending slavery*, it was an *impartial policy* in regard to the admission of States, and was governed by the principles of the Constitution, which guaranteed to every State in the Union a Republican form of government. The question, then, on the admission of a new State, was not whether it was to be a free or a Slave State, but whether in conformity to the Constitution it was to be admitted with a Republican form of government. It was not until 1820, on the admission of Missouri, that slavery began to be a consideration on the admission of a new State, it was then that the policy which "our fathers" had followed during thirty years was perverted by the demagogues and politicians.

It was during this period of 30 years that Washington, the elder Adams, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, administered the government, all men of the revolution familiar with the events that lead to the formation of the Constitution and well versed in the principles of Constitutional Government. The last three of these great men of the nation were Democrats and administered the government during *one half of this period*, in which Mr. Lincoln says they were following a policy "restricting the spread of slavery." Was the admission

of Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, *all Slave States*, admitted during this period, *restricting the spread of slavery*? Was the admission of Vermont, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Maine, *all free States*, admitted during this same period, *extending the spread of slavery*? Two of these States, and *Slave States* at that, were admitted during the administration of Washington, one of which was admitted upon *his recommendation*; the remaining States, except Vermont, *free and slave*, were admitted during the *Democratic Administrations* of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. It was in 1820, on the admission of Missouri as a slave State into the Union, that that fatal agitation of the slavery question first began to shake the foundation of the government, which now under the administration of a sectional Black Republican President, has rent it assunder, subverted the Constitution, and scattered the brands of civil war throughout the land.

I come, finally, to the consideration of the last quotation from Mr. Lincoln's speeches. In considering the adoption of the Constitution, its attendant history and the views of its framers, it is necessary to bear in mind the circumstances of the country and the people to whom the Constitution was adapted at the time of its formation. We have now a country vast in extent, second only to the greatest empire of the earth; greater than the Roman Empire in its greatest extent; a country unexplored and unknown to the framers of the Constitution at the formation of this Government. It never came within their conception, at the time of its adoption, that its jurisdiction was to be limited only by the waves of the Pacific. The horizon of their widest vision was bounded by the Great Lakes of the North, the Great Gulf of the South, and the mighty waters of the Mississippi. The area of the United States, *now*, is more than 3,300,000 square miles; *then*, it was less than 800,000, but larger than the largest empire of Europe, excepting Russia; and scattered over it was a population less than that of the least kingdom of Europe, a population less than that which now a single state contains. On the North were the Provinces of Great Britain; on the West and South were the possessions of Spain. To the latter opened a more flatter-

ing prospect of power and dominion than presented itself to either of the others, and the apprehension of trouble and danger from the proximity of so powerful a neighbor, early created alarm in the minds of American Statesmen. No steamboats then plowed the waters of the Western rivers, or the Northern lakes, or of the Southern Gulf—steam navigation was then unknown—beyond the Alleghanies was a wilderness stretching westward to the Mississippi, and from the Lakes to the Gulf, where prowled the wild beasts and the red men of the forest; perhaps an hundred thousand whites were scattered through this vast domain. East of the Alleghanies were nearly the whole population of the United States, and in every State, save one, from Maine to Georgia, the negro was the white man's slave.

At that early period there were doubts whether a common government could embrace so large a sphere, and if doubts, in regard to a common government, embracing a sphere, one quarter of the present area of the United States would not those doubts have been dispelled in the contemplation of its embracing a country nearly as large as the whole of Europe, and been converted into a conviction of the impracticability of such an apparently impossible scheme.

Mr. Ames, a member of the first Congress, in discussing a proposed amendment, establishing the ratio of representation, says:—"Now, if it has been questioned *whether this country can remain united* under a government administered by men of the *most consummate abilities*, the sons of *wisdom*, and the friends of *virtue*, how much more doubtful will it be if the administration is thrown into different hands; and *different hands must inevitably be employed if the representation is too large.*" The language of Washington, in his farewell address, delivered six years, subsequent to the preceding, relates wholly to the original United States.* Every American knows what that address is. If such were his apprehension, solicitude and fears, in regard to the original domain, and if such were the

* There have been three conditions of the United States. First. As the Confederation. Second. As the original Union under the present Constitution confined to the original limits. Thirdly. The United States bounded by the two Oceans, the Lakes and the Gulf.

multitude of dangers, which he pointed out as threatening the existence of that Union, what would have been his apprehension had his views been extended to the then unexplored and savage wilderness that stretched from the banks of the Mississippi to the unknown shores of the Pacific. His language of doubt in that address is as follows:—"Is there a doubt that a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. *To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal.* We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments, for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. *It is well worth a fair and full experiment.* With such powerful and obvious motives to union affecting all parts of our country, *while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability*, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bonds." Now, these doubts of Washington, and his effort to silence those who might doubt the *practicability of an experiment*, by impeaching their patriotism are strong evidences of his just apprehensions, and of the weakness of a Union that would not bear investigation.

Who made this government? Who laid the foundation upon which has been erected this mighty empire? Could this have been without the territories, which have been populated by the emigration from the original and from the foreign States? And to whom did this territory belong? The whole original territory of the United States may be set down at 800,000 square miles, of which about *one-fifth*, or 166,358 belonged to the Northern States, while nearly *four-fifths*, or 633,348 square miles belonged to the Southern States. Except the State of Massachusetts, which possessed Maine, none of the Northern States possessed territory outside of their present boundaries, while of the Southern States, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia, possessed extensive territories. That of Virginia, extending westward to the Mississippi, and embracing all the territory east of Pennsylvania, and north of the Ohio, the North Western Territory. That of Georgia and North Carolina, extending westward to the Mississippi. The thirty-first degree of Northern latitude was the Southern boundary of the United States.

“From the commencement of the revolutionary war, serious difficulties existed between the States, in relation to the disposition of large and unsettled territories, which were included in the chartered limits of some of the States. And some of the other States, * * which had no unsettled lands, insisted that as the unoccupied lands, if wrested from Great Britain, would owe them preservation to the common cause and the common sword, the money arising from them ought to be applied in just proportion among the several States to pay the expenses of the war, and ought not to be appropriated to the use of the State, in whose chartered limits they might happen to be, to the exclusion of the other States, by whose combined efforts and common expense the territory was defended and preserved against the claim of the British Government. These difficulties caused much uneasiness during the war, while the issue was in some degree doubtful, and the future boundaries of the United States yet to be defined by treaty if we achieved our independence. But these difficulties became much more serious after peace took place, and the boundaries of the United States were established. Every State at that time felt severely the pressure of its war debt; but in *Virginia, and some other States*, there were large territories of unsettled lands, the sale of which would *enable them* to discharge *their obligations* without much inconvenience, while other States, which had no such resources, saw before them many years of heavy and burdensome taxation; and the latter insisted for the reasons before stated, that these unsettled lands should be treated as the common property of the States, and the proceeds applied to their common benefit. The letters from the statesmen of that day will show how much this controversy occupied their thoughts, and the dangers that were apprehended from it. It was the disturbing element of the time, and fears were entertained that it might dissolve the Confederation by which the States were then united. These fears and dangers were however at once removed, when the State of Virginia, in 1784, voluntarily ceded to the United States the immense tract of country lying north-west of the river Ohio, and which was *within the acknowledged limits of the State*. The only object of

the State, in making this cession, was to put an end to the threatening and exciting controversy, and to enable the Congress of that time to dispose of the lands, and appropriate the proceeds as a common fund for the common benefit of the States. It was not ceded, because it was inconvenient to the State to hold and govern it, nor from any expectation that it could be better or more conveniently governed by the United States. The example of Virginia was soon afterwards followed by the other States, and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, all of the States, similarly situated, had ceded their unappropriated lands, except North Carolina and Georgia."—[*Taney.*]

Thus did Virginia, which had, and has done more than any other State for the formation of the Confederacy, the Constitution, and the Government voluntarily ceded to the United States all her territory west of Pennsylvania and north of the Ohio, the North Western Territory, a terraqueous area, more than double that of all the Northern States. Thus did this noble and magnanimous State, the mother of Presidents, of great good and wise men, quiet the apprehensions of her lesser sister States, and lay the corner stone of the foundation of the great Republic of the West.

The total number of the original States was thirteen; seven small, one medium, and five large. The total area of all the small States did not exceed that of any one of the five large States. Of the small States *five* were Northern and *two* Southern. The circumstance of the Northern territory, Vermont and Maine, which remained to be converted into States, was such that the States to be formed out of it would be one small, and the other not exceeding the medium size, if only two were formed out of the whole territory. The circumstance of the Northern territory was such that it indicated there would be four large States formed out of it. The first act of Virginia favoring the separation of Kentucky, passed January, 1786, thus was indicated the size of Kentucky. Events were placing Tennessee in the same relation to North Carolina, that Kentucky was to Virginia. The Tombigby River indicated what would be the line to divide the territory of Georgia into two States. Thus current events and

the natural and conventional boundaries indicated the size of the future Southern States, and it was evident to Southern Statesmen what would be their number.

A resolution of Congress, of the Confederation, passed 1780, fixed the area of the States to be formed out of territory ceded to the Confederate Government, at "*not less than one hundred, nor more than one hundred and fifty miles square, or as near thereto as circumstances will admit.*" This would have converted the North Western Territory, which was about all the territory the Confederate Government possessed, into ten petty States, a number almost double that of all the Southern States, had they retained their territory; giving to the North seventeen States; to the South six. But the Ordinance of 1787 limited the number of States to be formed out of that territory at *not less than three nor more than five*, the latter number giving the average size of the States the dimension of that of the larger of the original States, and making the relation of all the Northern to all the Southern States, including on both sides these existing and these in prospect—as 14 to 10.

The ordinance of 1787 excludes slavery from the territory which Virginia had ceded to the Confederate Government, the object for which that territory had been ceded would not have been accomplished had not slavery been excluded. One of the designs of its cession was to satisfy the demands and wants of the inhabitants of the northern States, who were almost without territory, for the purpose of forming free States with their increasing population, who would seek new lands beyond the limits of their native State; besides, it equalized the territory and gave an equilibrium between the political power of the North and the South in the House of Representatives, while no vital measure could be carried in the Senate without the concurrence of the Southern Senators.

It is true that slavery existed in the Southern States at the time of the formation of the Constitution, but there was then already at the North a public sentiment opposed to it. As early as 1783 the Quakers had presented petitions to Congress for the abolition of slavery, and the slave trade. Except New York and New Jersey,

there were very few slaves in any of the Northern States; the total number amounted to 40,370. In the South there were, about the time of the formation of the Constitution, 657,527 slaves, 203,427 of whom were owned by Virginia, but Virginia alone was half as large as all the Northern States.

Virginia, that ceded to the Confederacy the North Western Territory, with restrictions prohibiting slavery within its limits, possessed also Kentucky, which district on the 8th of August, 1786, passed in Convention the following resolution:—"That it is the indispensable duty of this Convention to make application to the General Assembly, at the coming session, for an Act to separate this district from the present government, forever, on terms honorable to both, and injurious to neither." The Legislature of Virginia received the petition and passed an Act providing for the election, on the ensuing August, by the *free white male inhabitants* of the district, of five representatives from each County, who should determine whether it was expedient for, and the will of the people of the district that it should be erected into an independent State on certain conditions. It was enacted that if the Convention should approve of separation, a day should be appointed posterior to the 1st September 1787, when the authority of Virginia should cease, provided that Congress should, prior to 1st June 1787, assent to the separation, relieve Virginia from her federal obligations arising therefrom, and admit Kentucky as a State, into the Federal Union.

Indian hostilities prevented the assembling of a quorum of the Convention, and a committee presented a memorial, praying an alteration of terms in the separating Act. The memorial was granted, and an Act in conformity was passed—arrived at Danville in January, 1787, after a formal vote had been taken in favour of the separation, and thus delayed the separation. Mr. Marshall, to whom the memorial had been transmitted, addressed a letter to the Convention, explanatory of the course taken by the parent Commonwealth. The most important reason was, that the delay in executing the Act of Virginia, had rendered it impracticable to obtain the assent of Congress before June, 1787. The new Act of Virginia

continued its assent to the separation, but postponed its operation until the 1st January, 1789. On the 29th February, 1788, the address of the Kentucky Convention, praying for admission into the Union, was presented to the old Congress, by which, on the 3rd July, it was referred to the new Government, for ultimate decision. A Bill before the new Congress, providing for the admission of Kentucky into the Union, was finally passed, January 28th, 1791.

Now here is a State larger than five of the original seven Northern States, and with only 10,000 slaves within its borders, applying to the very State that ceded the North Western Territory, with the restriction of the Ordinance of 1787, prohibiting slaves within that Territory, and at the very time of the framing of that Ordinance; and to the Congress at the very time of the framing of the Constitution—to the former for independence of it, and to the latter for admission into the Confederacy of States. The State of Virginia consents to its separation and independence, without a restriction on slavery. The Congress of the Confederacy refers its application to the new Government, by which it is admitted into the Union on an equality with the other States, and without a restriction on slavery. A new Government, that formed with a full knowledge of all the facts relating to the North Western Territory, and the district of Kentucky, had not placed a clause in the Constitution requiring the abolition of slavery within its borders, as the terms of the admission of a State into the Union; but, on the contrary, had made the importation of African slaves a lawful pursuit to all the States of the Union for a term of eighteen years from the inauguration of the new government. Mr. Lincoln may “think,” “believe,” and “say” what he pleases of the policy of government in regard to slavery and the territories, and his infatuated followers may credit what he says, thinks, and believes; but men of *free minds* will require and investigate the facts in evidence, and decide according to the convictions of an enlightened reason and an impartial judgment.

But the cession of the North Western Territory is to be considered in another point of view, and in considering it in this light it becomes necessary to present facts in evidence of what has been pre-

viously stated. Among the other objects of the cession of this territory was the raising of a revenue for the general government, and the liquidation of the debts of the Confederacy. The following language of Mr. Scott, a member of the first Congress, will convey some idea of the importance of that cession in this respect. Mr. Scott said in Congress:—"But a very inconsiderable part of the soil, and that far from being the most excellent, has been disposed of, yet the sales amount to 4,936,863 dollars; land for almost five millions of specie dollars has been already sold in that district; a sum amounting to near one-fifth—to more than one-sixth—of the whole domestic debt of America. This treasure which we possess has done thus much toward extinguishing a debt bearing hard upon every part of the Union. Have any of the States done as much? Have any of them made an exertion equal to this inconsiderable effort? No, they have not? Have all the States together done as much? No, they are incapable of doing what this wilderness has done?" There were no doubts of the statesmen of that day, that the sale of these lands, if properly managed, would "pay the principal and interest of all the debts of the United States."

The extent and resources of this territory are now known, then it was conjectured. It was conceived that it would contain 6,000,000 of inhabitants, or double that of the then inhabitants of the United States; whereas it now contains 7,000,000 of inhabitants, and is capable of containing more than 14,000,000, if populated as Ohio now is; but it is quite probable that this territory alone, will ultimately contain as great a population as that of the whole United States at the present time, 30,000,000; such was the munificence and magnanimity of the Old Dominion, whose statesmen and heroes from Washington to Scott, have ever stood the first in council and in arms.

It was the early object of the Government to sell these lands to actual settlers. There were two especial reasons for doing so, viz:—"To raise a revenue and to fix the settlers on the lands of the General Government, and thus prevent them from settling up on the public domain, a government independent of the United States, and

from emigrating to the other side of the Mississippi river, where the soil was as fertile and the climate equally agreeable, and where the Spanish Governor held out "an invitation to all persons inclined to settle in the western country; offering them, as inducements, lands without charge, exemption from taxes, protection in civil and religious liberty; besides provisions and implements of husbandry."

The men who first settle in a wilderness upon the frontiers, between the savage and the civilized portion of a country, are men of enterprising, violent, discontented, turbulent spirits; these characters were already in that territory by thousands, and their numbers were daily increasing. Already the intrigues of foreign powers were endeavoring to sever the Union; to build up an independent empire in the Western Territory of the Government.

The following language, uttered in the Congress of 1789, by a member, conveys a correct and vivid idea of those times:—"There are seven thousand souls waiting for lands, they will have them here or elsewhere; but there is some danger if they cannot be accommodated within the boundaries of the United States, they will do one of two things; either move into the Spanish Territory, and become an accession of power to a foreign nation, forming to us a dangerous frontier; or they will take this course, move on the United States Territory and take possession without your leave. What then will be the case? They will not pay you money. Will you raise a force to drive them off? That has been tried; troops were raised and sent under General Harmer, to effect that purpose. They burnt the cabins, broke down the fences and tore up the potatoe patches; but three hours after the troops were gone, those people returned again, repaired the damages, and are now settled upon the lands in open defiance of the authority of the Union. But, nevertheless, they are willing to pay an equitable price for those lands. But if you do not listen to their request; if you neglect or despise their offers and they prove too weak to resist the omnipotent arm of Government, they will have recourse to a neighboring Power for protection. Hopes of that protection are now held out to them." "Your citizens, I tell you, are already there by thousands; they are going by thousands

D

more, and are every hour growing up into consequence. They never expect to return into the Atlantic States; plant them in your soil; add this wealth of population to your own, and form an empire illustrious as it is extended."

Another member said:—"The unappropriated land in the Western Territory is a great fund of wealth, and which, if properly disposed of, might extinguish the national debt, and be peopled by a valuable class of citizens; but if, from a mistaken policy, it was thrown away upon foreign adventurers or speculators, the public would get nothing for it. It is true, such measures may induce a number of foreigners to come among us; but then it ought to be remembered that such are generally persons of different education, manners and customs, from the citizens of the Union, and not so likely to harmonize in a Republican Government as might be wished consequently any considerable accession of this class of settlers might tend to disturb the harmony and tranquility, and embarrass the operation of the Government. He thought it worthy of inquiry, whether America stood in need of emigrants to people her territory. He supposed the notorious rapid population of the present inhabitants was, of itself, sufficient for the purpose."

The Government of the United States, formed and inaugurated, required a revenue to support and carry it into operation. The donation of Virginia gave the basis of a revenue adequate to the demands of the Government. But these lands had to be sold to raise that revenue, and, therefore, settlers became necessary to purchase and settle the territory, this led to the subject of emigration, this to the naturalization of foreign emigrants. Thus the commencement and progress of the Government developed its resources, its wants and its policy; and as conflicting views in regard to the best measures to effect a purpose, are the origin of parties, *they* necessarily sprung from the progress of government; then selfish interest and ambition begat demagogues and politicians, who *misrepresented* the objects of their opponents, *concealed their own*, and left no means untried to effect their purpose; thus factions controlled the influence, and directed the power of parties; and the patriotic efforts and designs of the founders

of the Government were directed to the perversion of its principles and the destruction of the Constitution which they had made for the preservation of the property, the lives, the liberty, and the happiness of the people.

Mr. Lincoln, page 224, says:—"It may be agreed that there are certain conditions that make necessities and impose them upon us, and to the extent that a necessity is imposed upon a man he must submit to it. I think that was *the condition in which we found ourselves when we established this government*. We had slaves among us; *we could not get our Constitution unless we permitted them to remain in slavery*; we could not secure the good we did secure, if we grasped for more, and having by necessity submitted to that much, it does not destroy the principle that is the charter of our liberties."

The condition in which we found ourselves when we established this government, was this:—Slavery in every State, except one; as many in New Jersey as then in Kentucky; as many in Pennsylvania as then in Tennessee; New York the sixth in the number of its slaves; and two States, North Carolina and Rhode Island, returned to their original independent condition; such was the condition, when in 1789 the government was established. Slaves were in nearly every State, and could not the Constitution be had without permitting them *to remain in slavery*? Were they permitted to remain in slavery? Have they not been liberated in *seven* of the original thirteen States? And what was *the necessity imposed upon ourselves* when *we* established this government? There was no necessity *imposed* upon any State? Each State was *perfectly free* to ratify or not the Constitution that was submitted to it. Neither North Carolina nor Rhode Island thought proper to do so, and did not, until after the Confederation had been destroyed, and the new government had been established; the one State remaining independent for eight months and the other for more than a year; being during that time neither members of the Confederation nor members of the new Union. No necessity was imposed upon the States which *objected* to slavery to unite with those which *preferred* it. There

could have been two governments, as there would have been, had the Northern States determined, in the framing of the Constitution, to abolish slavery, and the Southern States to retain it. The Southern States could have done much better without the Northern States than the Northern States could have done without the Southern; the Southern States had a population equal to that of the Northern, and possessed *four-fifths* of the territory. But examine the principle of Mr. Lincoln's mode of argument, and the rational inference. Necessity *compelled* the Northern States, which were opposed to slavery, to unite with the Southern, which were in favor of it, and *to the extent of the necessity* they had to *submit*, and now the *force* of the necessity no longer operating the North are freed from the obligations which it originally imposed. But the Constitution is itself a reputation of Mr. Lincoln's assertion.

“Article vii. The ratification of the Conventions of *nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution* between the States so ratifying the same.” This was all that was required by the Constitution to establish a constitutional government under the present system. Will Mr. Lincoln deny that the Northern States and Delaware, and Maryland, being nine of the original thirteen States, could not have formed an independent constitutional government? Will he deny that the remaining Southern States, whose territory would still have been as large as that of the government thus formed, even though it were enlarged by the accession of the North Western Territory, could not have formed a government, “laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to *them* should seem most likely to effect *their* safety and happiness?” He cannot without controverting the Constitution and denying the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION.

The following resolution was passed in the Confederate Congress, on February 21, 1787. "Resolved, That in the opinion of Congress, it is expedient that on the second Monday in May next, a Convention of delegates, who shall have been appointed by the several States, be held at Philadelphia *for the sole and express purpose of revising the articles of Confederation* and reporting to Congress and the several Legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein as shall, *when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the States*, render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government and the preservation of the Union."

The purposes for which this Convention was to assemble, are expressed as plainly as language can convey ; and, in the appointment of the Delegates to that Convention, by the several States, the same or synonymous language is used ; so there is nothing to indicate the wish or intention of the several States to overthrow their Constitution and establish another ; but on the contrary, the words of the resolution plainly indicate that the "Articles of Confederation" were still to remain as the Constitution of the Confederacy ; for the very manner in which "such alterations and provisions" were to be made valid, was, according to the Articles of Confederation, which says, "The Articles of this Confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State, and the Union shall be perpetual ; nor shall any alteration at any time hereafter be made in any of them, unless such alteration be *agreed to in a Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the Legislature of every State.*"

The convention consisting of thirty-nine members, viz:—From New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Georgia, two each ; from Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina, three each ; from New Jersey and South Carolina, four each ; from Delaware, five ; from

New York, one; from Pennsylvania, eight; met at Philadelphia on Monday, 14th of May, 1787, and on the 17th September, 1787, agreed to the Constitution. The number of Members from Pennsylvania is remarkably disproportionate to the number from any of the other States; it was nearly as large as that of all the Members from the other Northern States; double that of the Members from any one of the Southern States. Two of its Members were afterwards representatives from that State to the First Congress; one of whom introduced the first petition for the abolition of slavery, that was ever presented to Congress; it was from the Society of Friends in Philadelphia. Another of its Members was the President of the first Abolition Society that ever existed in the United States; the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, and signed, as the President of that Society, the third petition for the abolition of Slavery, that was presented to Congress; all of which petitions were presented to Congress in rapid succession, during the Session of 1790. Supposing the Convention to have been in session every day, except Sundays, the whole time employed in framing the Constitution would be one hundred and eight days. The Convention having agreed to the Constitution, passed the following resolutions:—

Resolved,—"That the preceding Constitution be laid before the United States in Congress assembled, and that it is the opinion of this Convention, that it should afterwards be submitted to a Convention of Delegates chosen in each State, by the people thereof, under the recommendation of its Legislature, for their assent and ratification; and that each Convention assenting to and ratifying the same, should give notice thereof to the United States, in Congress assembled."

Resolved,—"That it is the opinion of this Convention, that as soon as the Conventions of nine States shall have ratified this Constitution, the United States, in Congress assembled, should fix a day on which electors should be appointed by the States which shall have ratified the same; and a day on which the electors should assemble to vote for the President; and the time and place for com-

mencing proceedings under this Constitution, &c., &c." Congress accordingly, passed a resolution, transmitting the Constitution to the several Legislatures for the purpose before stated, and the States having accordingly passed Acts for severally calling Conventions, the Constitution was submitted to them, and ratified in the following order:—By Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, in December, 1787; Georgia and Connecticut, January, 1788; Massachusetts, February, 1788; Maryland, April, 1788; South Carolina, May, 1788; New Hampshire and Virginia, June, 1788; New York, July, 1788; North Carolina, November 21, 1789; Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.

All the requisitions of the Constitution, and of the resolutions of the Convention which framed it, in regard to establishing it as a form of Government, among the States so ratifying it, having been complied with by the requisite number of States, and the election of the Senators, Representatives, President and Vice President having been made, by appointment of Congress, the Government of the United States, under the present Constitution, was inaugurated with the inauguration of Washington as the first President, on the 30th of April, 1789.

The Constitution had required the ratification of the Conventions of but nine States to establish it between the States so ratifying it. It will be seen that more than that number had ratified it, before it went into operation. It will be seen that both North Carolina and Rhode Island remained independent of the new Government and did not ratify the Constitution, and thereby become members of the new Union—the one until after the lapse of nine months, and the other until after more than a year from the dissolution of the Confederation.

The Constitution closes with these words, viz: "Done in Convention by the unanimous consent of the States present, on the 17th September, 1787." Now there were three delegates from North Carolina to the Convention which framed the Constitution, and they each signed that instrument. But the State of North Carolina did not consent to *that* Constitution, nor did she ratify the Constitution until it had been amended, while it appears that Rhode Island took no part in the formation of the Constitution.

The Articles of Confederation were to have been "*inviolably observed by every State,*" nor was there *any alteration* to be made in *any of them unless agreed to in Congress and confirmed by every State*; and the Delegates from the several States, who signed the articles of Confederation, *solemnly pledged and engaged the faith of their respective constituents*, that the articles thereof should be inviolably observed by the States which they respectively represented. So much for the "*solemnly plighted faith*" in regard to the Articles of Confederation. Now turn to the consideration of the implied faith in regard to the formation of the Constitution.

What were the views of the people and prominent men of that time in regard to this instrument designed for the protection and preservation of all that they held most dear. There was a general, if not a universal idea of its deficiencies. Yet the promise of amendments, held out by the instrument itself, induced Members of the Convention that framed it, and Members of the Convention that ratified it, to accept it as it was.

Here is the voice of Virginia on the Constitution, "In the very moment of adoption, and co-eval with the ratification of the new plan of government; the general voice of the Convention of this State pointed to objects not less interesting to the people we represent, and equally entitled to our attention. At the same time, that, from *motives of affection for our sister States*, the Convention yielded their assent to the ratification, they gave the most unequivocal proofs, that *they dreaded its operation, under the present form*. In acceding to the government, under this impression, painful must have been the prospect, had they not derived consolation from a full expectation of its imperfections being speedily amended. * * * We deem it unnecessary to enter into a particular detail of its *defects which they consider as involving all the great and inalienable rights of freemen*." Such was the opinion of the people of Virginia as expressed through their General Assembly, November 14, 1788.

Mr. White, a member of the first Congress, said:—"I think a *majority of the people*, who have ratified the Constitution, did it under the expectation that Congress would at some convenient time

examine its texture and point out where it was defective, in order that it might be judiciously amended."

Mr. Madison, a member of the first Congress, said :—"It cannot be a secret to the gentlemen of this House, that notwithstanding the ratification of this system of government by eleven of the thirteen United States, in some cases unanimously, in others by large majorities; yet still there is a great number of our constituents who are dissatisfied with it." And so on, throughout the debate in Congress on the amendment of the Constitution, are the same sentiments of its deficiencies, and apprehension of its effects expressed by numerous representatives to that body, nearly all acknowledge the necessity of amendments; but there was a difference of opinion, in regard to the order and time of them. Among the reasons advanced for making immediate amendment, was to induce the States of Rhode Island and North Carolina to enter into the Union; thus showing the influence of these States upon the passage of the amendments that were adopted.

Mr. Gerry, from Massachusetts, said :—"I am not, Sir, one of those blind admirers of this system, who think it all perfections; nor am I so blind as not to see its beauties. The truth is, it partakes of humanity; in it is blended virtue and vice, errors and excellence." "Whatever might have been my sentiments of the ratification of the Constitution, without amendments, my sense now is that *the salvation of America depends upon the establishment of this government*, whether amended or not. *If the Constitution, which is now ratified, should not be supported, I despair of ever having a government of these United States.*" "The ratification of the Constitution, in several States, would never have taken place had they not been assured that the objections would have been duly attended to by Congress. And I believe many members of these Conventions would never have voted for it, if they had not been persuaded that Congress would notice them with that candor and attention which their importance requires."

Mr. Sherman, from Connecticut, said, in speaking of the Constitution :—"It is a wonder that there has been such unanimity in

adopting it, *considering the ordeal* it had to undergo, and *the unanimity* which prevailed at its formation *is equally astonishing* ; amidst all the members from twelve States present at the Federal Convention there were only *three who did not sign the instrument* to attest their opinion of its goodness. Of the eleven States who have received it, *the majority* have ratified it without proposing a single amendment. *This circumstance leads me to suppose that we shall not be able to propose any alterations that are likely to be adopted by nine States.*" I give this quotation from Mr. Sherman's speech, because he was one of the framers of the Constitution, the whole of these remarks of Mr. Sherman are explained by the previous and following quotation from the speech of Elbridge Gerry, and all go to evince the anxiety and difficulty that existed in framing and adopting the Constitution.

Mr. Gerry said : — " He wished gentlemen to consider the situation of the States ; *seven* out of thirteen had thought the Constitution very defective, yet, *five* of them have adopted it with a perfect reliance in Congress for its improvement. 'The indelicacy of treating the application of five States in a manner different from other important subjects will give no small occasion for disgust. * * *

The members from Massachusetts were particularly instructed to press the amendments recommended by the Convention of that State, at all times, until they had been maturely considered by Congress ; the same duties were made incumbent on the members from some other States."

Mr. Page : " Was positive the people would never support this government unless their anxiety was removed. He begged gentlemen to consider the importance of *the number of citizens who were anxious for amendments* ; *if these had been added to those who openly opposed the Constitution it possibly might have met a different fate.*"

Mr. Smith : " Read extracts from the amendments proposed by several of the States Conventions, at the time they ratified the Constitution, from which he said it appeared they were generally of opinion that the phraseology of the Constitution ought to be altered."

Mr. Gerry : "The Constitution of the United States was proposed by a Convention, met at Philadelphia ; but with all its importance, it did not possess as high authority as the President, Senate, and House of Representatives of the Union. For that Convention was not convened in consequence of any express will of the people, but an implied one through their members in the State Legislatures *The Constitution derived no authority from the first Convention ; it was concurred in by Conventions of the people, and that concurrence armed it with power, and invested it with dignity.*"

Mr. Sumter said : "The people have already complained that *the adoption of the Constitution was done in too hasty a manner.* What will they say of us if we press the amendments with so much haste?"

Mr. Tucker : "My idea, relative to this Constitution while it was dependent upon the assent of the several States, was, that it required amendment ; and that the proper time for amendment was previous to the ratification. My reason was, that I can conceive it *difficult, if not impossible, to obtain essential amendments, by the way pointed out in the Constitution, nor have I been mistaken in these suspicions.*"

Mr. Burk : "Begged permission to make an observation or two ; the first was on the assertion that had been repeated more than once in this house, 'That this revolution or adoption of the new Constitution was agreeable to the public mind, and those who opposed it at first, are now satisfied with it.' I believe, Sir, that many of those gentlemen who agreed to the ratification, without amendments, *did it from principles of patriotism, but they knew, at the same time, that they parted with their liberties ; yet they had such reliance on the virtue of a future Congress, that they did not hesitate, expecting that they would be restored to them unimpaired, as soon as the government commenced its operations, conformably to what was mutually understood at the sealing and delivering up of these instruments.*"

These were the sentiments of members of a body possessed of higher authority than the Convention that framed the Constitution ; of persons elected by the people, whose embodiment they represented, and whose sentiments they expressed.

Intelligent and impartial readers, in considering the quotations given from the speeches of prominent members of the first Congress, can learn much of the manner of the framing of the Constitution, the motives, the artifices, the designs of the framers, and amenders; much of the wishes, the expectations, the disappointments and apprehensions of the people; much of State policy and of public sentiment.

Some quotations will now be given, showing the manner in which amendments were entertained in Congress :

Mr. Page said that he hoped every amendment to the Constitution would be considered separately in the manner this was proposed, but he wished them considered fully; it ought to have been *referred to the Committee of eleven, reported upon, and then to the Committee of the whole*. This was the manner in which the House had decided upon *all those already agreed to*, and this ought to be the manner in which this should be decided; he should be sorry to delay what was so *nearly completed*, on any account.

Mr. Burk: "I do not mean to insist particularly upon this amendment, but I am very well satisfied that those that are reported and likely to be adopted by this House, are very far from giving satisfaction to our constituents; *they are not those solid and substantial amendments which the people expect*; they are little better than the whipped syllabub, frothy, and full of wind, formed only to please the palate; or they are like a tub thrown out to a whale, to secure the freight of the ship, and its peaceable voyage. In my judgment, the people will not be gratified by the mode we have pursued in bringing them forward. *There was a Committee of eleven appointed*, and out of the number, I think there were *five who were Members of the Convention that formed the Constitution*; such gentlemen having already given their opinion, with respect to the perfection of the work, may be thought *improper agents to bring forward amendments*." "He never entertained any idea of charging gentlemen with the want of candor; but he would appeal to any men of sense and candor, whether the amendments contained in the report, were anything like *the amendments required by the States of New York*,

Virginia, New Hampshire and North Carolina; and having the amendments in his hand, he turned to them to show the difference, concluding that *all the important amendments were omitted in the report.*"

Mr. Gerry: "Gentlemen seem in a great hurry to get this business through. I think it requires a further discussion; for my part I had rather do less business, and do it well, than *precipitate business before they are fully understood.* The honorable gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Madison) stated that if the proposed amendments are defeated, it will be by the delay attending the discussion of doubtful propositions, and he declares this to partake of that quality. *It is natural, Sir, for us to be fond of our own work.* We do not like to see it *disfigured by other hands.* That honorable gentleman brought forward a *string of propositions*, among them was *the clause now proposed* to be amended; *he is no doubt ready for the question*, and determined not to admit what we think an improvement. The gentlemen who were on *the Committee*, and brought in the report, *have considered* the subject, and *are also ripe for a decision.* But other gentlemen may crave a like indulgence. Is not the report before us for deliberation and discussion, and to obtain the sense of the House upon it, and will not gentlemen allow us a day or two for those purposes, *after they have forced us to proceed upon them at this time?* I appeal to their candor and good sense on the occasion, and am sure not to be refused; and I must inform them now, *that they may not be surprised hereafter*, that I wish *all the amendments proposed by the respective States* to be considered. Gentlemen say it is necessary to finish the subject, in order to reconcile a number of our fellow citizens to the government. If this is their principle, they ought to consider the wishes and intentions which the Convention has expressed for them; if they do this, they will find that they expect, and wish for the declaration proposed by the honorable gentleman over the way (Mr. Tucker) and, of consequence, they ought to agree to it; and *why it with others, recommended in the same way, were not reported*, I cannot pretend to say. *The Committee knew this best themselves.*

Mr. Vining: "If there appears on one side too great an urgency, to dispatch this business, there appears, on the other, an unnecessary delay and procrastination equally *improper* and *unpardonable*. I think this business has been already well considered by the House, and *every* gentleman in it; *however*, I am not for *unseemly expedition*. The gentleman last up *has insinuated a reflection upon the Committee* for not reporting all the amendments proposed by *some* of the State Conventions. I can assign a reason for this. The Committee conceived *some* of them *superfluous* or *dangerous*, and found *many* of them *so contradictory* that it was *impossible to make any thing of them*." Such are the reasons given by Mr. Vining, why the *Committee* did not report the proposed amendments. Examine them.

Mr. Ames says: "America has as great a proportion of men of sense and judgment as any nation on earth." The Conventions, which presented their proposed amendments, were composed of the *best and wisest men that America could produce*, and what were the fruits of their labors of wisdom and patriotism? Why, according to Mr. Vining and the Committee, "*some* of them *superfluous* or *dangerous*," "*many* of them *so contradictory* that it was *impossible to make any thing of them*." Did the Committee consider themselves wiser than the House, and therefore thought it improper to report the amendments; lest the House should form an opinion of them different from, or opposite to its own? Or did they fear the wisdom of the House would adopt amendments, indicative of the wishes of the people, which would charge what the public sentiment was opposed to in the Constitution, and thus materially alter the work, which *five* of the *eleven* of which the Committee consisted had helped to frame in the Convention that produced the Constitution?

CONCERNING NATURALIZATION.

The first clause of the Bill first proposed establishing an uniform rule of Naturalization, enacted that *all free white persons* who have or shall emigrate to the United States, and shall give satisfactory proof, before a magistrate, by oath, that they intend to reside therein; and shall take an oath of allegiance; and shall have resided in the United States for one whole year, shall be entitled to all the rights of citizenship, except being capable of holding an office under the State or General Government, which capacity they are to acquire after a residence of two years more.

Mr. Sherman, "Thought that the interests of the State, where the emigrant intended to reside, ought to be consulted, as well as the interests of the General Government. He presumed it was intended by the Convention which framed the Constitution, that Congress should have the power of naturalization, in order to prevent particular States receiving citizens, and forcing them upon others who would not have received them in any other manner. It was therefore meant to guard against an improper mode of naturalization, rather than foreigners should be received upon easier terms than those adopted by the several States. Now, the regulation provided for in this Bill, entitles *all free white persons*, which includes emigrants, and even those who are likely to become chargeable. It certainly never would be undertaken by Congress, to compel the States to receive and support this class of persons; it would, therefore, be necessary that some clause should be added to the Bill to counteract such a general proposition."

Mr. Lawrence said, "The reason of admitting foreigners to the right of citizenship among us, is the encouragement of emigration, as we have a large tract of country to people."

Mr. Madison said: "When we are considering the advantages that may result from an easy mode of naturalization, we ought also to consider the caution necessary to guard against abuses. It is, no doubt, very desirable that we should hold out as many inducements as possible, for the worthy part of mankind to come and settle among us, and throw their fortunes into a common lot with ours. But why is this desirable? not merely to swell the catalogue of people, No sir, it is to increase the *wealth and strength* of the community; and those who acquire the rights of citizenship without adding to the strength or wealth of the community, are not the people we are in want of."

Mr. Jackson: "Conceived the present subject to be of *high importance to the respectability and character of the American name*. The veneration he had for, and the attachment he had to this country, made him extremely anxious to preserve its good fame from injury. He hoped to see *the title of a citizen of America as highly venerated and respected as was that of a citizen of old Rome*. I am clearly of opinion that, rather than have the common class of vagrants, paupers and other outcasts of Europe, we had better be as we are, and trust to the natural increase of our population for inhabitants."

Mr. Sherman: "He said the unappropriated lands in the Western Territory was a great fund of wealth, and which, if properly disposed of, might extinguish the national debt, and be peopled by a valuable class of citizens; but if from a mistaken policy it was thrown away upon foreign adventurers, or speculators, the public would get nothing for it, as had been the case heretofore in the sale of large districts where the expense attending the surveys, &c., left very little profit to the United States. It is true, such measures may induce a number of foreigners to come among us, but then it ought to be remembered that such are generally persons of different education, manners and customs, from the citizens of the Union, and *not likely to harmonize in a Republican Government*, as might be wished; consequently any considerable accession of this class of settlers *might tend to disturb the harmony and tranquility, and embarrass the*

operations of Government. He thought it was worthy of inquiry, whether America stood in need of emigrants to people her territory. *He supposed the notorious rapid population of the present inhabitants was, of itself, sufficient for the purpose.* But nevertheless, he was willing to let foreigners come in *gradually*, and in the same way he was inclined to dispose of the lands."

Mr. Page : " Was of opinion that the policy of European nations and States did not apply to the situation of the United States. *Bigotry and superstition*, or a *deep-rooted prejudice* against the *government, laws, religion, or manners* of neighboring nations had a weight in that policy, which cannot exist here, where a more liberal system ought to prevail. I think we shall be inconsistent to ourselves, if, after having opened an ASYLUM FOR THE OPPRESSED OF ALL NATIONS, and established a government which is THE ADMIRATION OF THE WORLD, we make the terms of admission to the full enjoyment of that asylum, so HARD AS IS NOW PROPOSED. It is nothing to us whether Jews or Roman Catholics settle among us ; whether subjects of Kings, or citizens of free States wish to reside in the United States. They will find it their interest to be good citizens, and neither their religious nor political opinions can injure us *if we have good laws well executed.*" Mr. Page is a real Knight-errant on the subject of universal liberty, universal suffrage, universal benevolence, and universal philanthropy ; but strange to say, he has not lugged in the negro, though the bill specifies "*free white persons.*" Mr. Page would have it believed that a foreigner on emigrating to America could shuffle off his *bigotry, superstition, deep-rooted prejudices* against *government, laws, religion, and manners*, as a beggar would his filthy, tattered clothes for a new suit. The American people were certainly very magnanimous to take under their especial charge, care, and protection, *the oppressed of all nations*, and fight during seven years to give them an *asylum*. If such were their motive, if such were their design, it might be very appropriately styled an *insane asylum*, both in regard to its founders, its inmates, and its principles. But the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States tell a very different story.

Whether they, or Mr. Page, and his modern followers, in this respect, are correct, is for common sense and impartial judgment to decide. The Declaration says:—"When a long train of abuses, and usurpations pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them (mankind) under absolute despotism it is *their right*, it is *their duty*, to throw off such government, and to *provide new guards for their future security*. Such has been the patient suffering of these Colonies, and such is now *the necessity which constrains them* to alter their former system of government." The preamble to the Constitution says:—"We, the people of the United States, in order to, &c., &c., and secure the Blessings of Liberty to *ourselves and our posterity*, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." This crazy philanthropy which sacrifices the particular interests of a nation, to the general welfare of *the whole world and whole human race*, has ever been injurious, in its effect, to the best interest of humanity, and has, in its ascendancy, ever overthrown institutions founded on wisdom and experience; subverted the foundations of Government and religion; and substituted in their place, anarchy, infidelity and ruin. But to proceed in showing the sentiments of the men who made and organized this Government, at the time of its construction.

Mr. Lawrence said: "Nor do I believe, Sir, there is any just ground of apprehension that people will come to this city, from Nova Scotia, or *any other part of the world* in bodies of *three or four thousand* to turn our elections or interfere in our politics, and while I am free from these apprehensions, and suppose that the true policy of this country is to make the terms of admission easy, *in order to people our country*, I shall be against every measure which has a tendency to throw obstacles in the way."

Mr. Burk: "Thought it of importance to fill the country with useful men, such as farmers, mechanics, and manufacturers, and therefore would hold out every encouragement to them to emigrate to America. This class he would receive on liberal terms; and *he was satisfied there would be room enough for them and for their posterity for five hundred years to come*. There was another class

of men whom he did not think useful, and did not care what impediments were thrown in the way, such as your European Merchants and factors of Merchants who come with a view of remaining so long as will enable them to acquire a fortune, and then they will leave the country and carry off all their property with them. *I look upon the privilege of an American citizen to be an honorable one, and it ought not to be thrown away upon such people.* There is another class also that I would interdict, that is *the convicts and criminals* which they pour out of British jails, I wish sincerely some mode could be adopted *to prevent the importations of such*, but that, perhaps, *is not in our power*; the introduction of them ought to be considered as a high misdemeanor."

Mr. Sedgwick: "Was against *the indiscriminate admission of foreigners*, to the highest rights of human nature, upon terms so incompetent to secure the society from being overrun with the outcasts of Europe; besides *the policy of settling the vacant territory by emigration, is of a doubtful nature.* He believed, in the United States, the human specie might be multiplied by a more eligible, and convenient mode than what seemed to be contemplated by the motion now before the Committee. He was well satisfied for himself, that there existed no absolute necessity of peopling it in this way; and if there was no absolute necessity, he thought Congress might use their discretion, and admit *none but respectable and worthy characters*; such only *were fit for the society into which they were blended.* The citizens of America preferred this country, because it is to be preferred; the like principle he wished, might be held by every man who came from Europe to reside here; but there were at least some grounds to fear the contrary; *their sensations impregnated with prejudices of education, acquired under monarchical and aristocratical government*, may deprive them of that zeal for pure Republicanism, which is necessary, in order to taste its beneficence with that gratitude which we feel on the occasion."

Mr. Stone said:—"I think a term of four or seven years ought to be required. A foreigner, who comes here, is not desirous of interfering immediately with our politics; nor is it proper that he

should. His emigration is governed by a different principle ; he is desirous of obtaining and holding property. I should have no objections to his doing this from the first moment he sets his foot on shore in America ; but it appears to me that *we ought to be cautious how we admit emigrants to the other privileges of citizenship, and that for a reason not yet mentioned ; perhaps IT MAY ALLUDE TO THE NEXT GENERATION more than to this, because the present inhabitants, or most of them, have been engaged in a long, hazardous, and expensive war. They have been active in rearing up the present government ; and feel perhaps a laudable vanity in having effected what the most sanguine hardly dared to contemplate. There is no danger of these people losing what they so greatly esteem ; but the admission of a great number of foreigners to all the places of government may tincture the system with the dregs of their former habits and corrupt what we believe the most pure of all human institutions."*

In considering these remarks, it is necessary to bear in mind, that the subject under consideration was the naturalization of "*free white persons*;" that population, strength, wealth, and the settlement of the Territory of the United States are prominent among the ideas advanced ; and that these settlements more particularly related to the territory possessed by the general government of the United States, from the sales of which it was anticipated a sufficient revenue would be raised to defray the expenses of the government and liquidate the whole national debt. It was believed that there would be room in that territory for emigrants and their posterity for "*five hundred years to come*." It was not believed that emigrants would come in numbers of two and three thousand at a time. They had no idea of a modern steamship rushing across the Atlantic in 12 or 15 days with 500 emigrants at a trip, or of nearly half a million of foreigners landing on our shores within a single year. They had not conceived of the wonderful revolution of steam, nor of the mighty tides of foreign emigration that were to flow from the nations of Europe over the fertile prairies of the West, to the base of the Rocky Mountains, and through their passes, to the

golden shores of the Pacific. They were considering the settlement of a comparatively small piece of land, nearly the whole of which is now, after the lapse of—not five hundred years, but less than three quarters of a century, owned by private individuals, and peopled by more than double the number of the original population of the whole original States. They were legislating to found a nation that would continue to possess the Republican principles of its primitive purity; a nation that, in the moral and intellectual excellence of its citizens, would rank first among the most enlightened of Christian nations. They were emulous of making the name of American citizen the talisman of security and respect, among the nations of the earth; a prouder, loftier title than that of “Roman Citizen,” in the proudest palmiest days of the Mistress of the World.

Throughout the debate in Congress no objection was made by the founders of the government to “free *white* persons,” no allusion to the negro. Emigrants were expected from civilized, christianized, Europe alone. They were not emulous of making their country a Botany Bay, an asylum for the political refugees and criminals from “all nations,”—the Mahometan, infidel, idolator,—the Chinese, Hindoo, Hottentot! Their pride, their ambition, was like the emblem of their nation, when he towers in sublimity above all sublunary things. It was for the Serpent Abolition, the offspring of fanaticism, the bantling of a sect outside the pale of orthodox, christianity, a sect excentric in its dress, its language, its manners, and its religion, a sect ultra and outre, that has dwindled from the controlling influence in the community in which it ruled, to the most diminutive and insignificant proportions, while its crocodile egg has hatched a monster of the most gigantic dimensions. It was for this loathsome reptile, silently crawling in the dark sinks of human degradation and depravity, to gather in its foul embrace the most degraded of the human race; to infect with its poisonous breath the political atmosphere of the nation, and infuse its venom into the vitals of the Republic.

Among the chimerical ideas of crazy demagogues and politicians, is that of the Utopian scheme of universal Republicanism, as though the Republican form of government were “the admiration of the

world," and proper for all classes and conditions of humanity ; whereas, none but the most enlightened and virtuous are fit for the forms of Republican Government, while the opposite extreme, the most ignorant and debased, are fit only for the most absolute despotism. Between these two extremes are the various modifications of government, adapted to the circumstance and condition of a people. That government is best for the people for which it is designed, that is best adapted to the condition of that people. Governments after all are but governments ; their names neither make nor alter them ; freedom may exist under a monarchy, and despotism under a Republic. Is there less security to life and property, less intelligence and virtue, less prosperity and happiness in England, than in the United States ? Is there less freedom, security, and intelligence in Austria, than in Mexico—in the Republics of America, than in the monarchies of Europe ? The shameless demagogue that would have the brazen affrontery to assert it, in contradiction to the evidence of existing facts, is fit to be the idol and representative of the ignorant and illiterate people that would have the credulity to believe him.

When the condition of a people changes from that for which the government was designed, they are no longer fit to be governed by the principles of *that* government ; and when the principles of a government are changed to adapt them to the condition of a people, it is an evidence that the original condition of the people, for which that government was designed, has changed ; and that the original principles are no longer applicable to their condition. Thus springs the necessity of change, or revolution in a government ; peaceable or forcible, according to the circumstances of the case. Long resistance to necessary gradual changes, ultimately result in sudden and violent ones ; sudden and violent, and gradual and secret efforts at unnecessary changes of an established and beneficial policy, produces the same result. The first is the resistance of the government to the progress of the people, under the impression of enfeebling civil and political restraints so essential to the preservation of peace and true liberty. The second is the effort of the people, under the influence of demagogues, to subvert an appropriate government, and substi-

tute in its place, some Utopia of which no experience of past ages presents an example, but which is wholly inconsistent with all wisdom, all precedent, all experience.

The masses of mankind see only the objects around them, the immediate cause and effect, while the philosopher sees in the present, the subordinate of a remote cause and effect, originating in other worlds; and thus the comprehensive mind of the true Statesman embraces the whole principles of government within the sphere of their operation, and traces their origin, progress and effect, in ancient systems, and through distant ages.—He is controlled by the influence of wisdom and experience; but charlitans and demagogues consult present purposes, present interests; pander to the passions and the prejudices of the people; encourage their hopes, with the promise of future benefits; and excite their fears with the apprehension of future dangers; and thus play upon their passions to the consummation of their triumph, when they rise to power, upon the whirlwind they have raised, without the power to control, or the wisdom to direct; and leave the destruction of the government, and the ruin of the people, as the monument of their folly, and the fruit of their ambition.

CONCERNING SLAVERY.

The Constitution had been made and ratified by more Conventions in the respective States than had been required by that instrument to establish a government, which government was organized in regard to the legislative and executive departments on the 30th April, 1789; nine months from that date, 11th February, 1790, before the organization of the subordinate departments, and the transaction of business essential to the completion of all the machinery of government, in a word before the government was complete, Mr. Fitzsimons, the representative from Pennsylvania, and a member of the Convention, which made the Constitution, presented "the address of the people, called Quakers, in their annual assembly convened at Philadelphia, September 1789," "to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

This instrument is a literary curiosity, and in striking contrast to the affected simplicity and humility of the Quakers, being labored and Pharisaical. In plain language the address was a petition to Congress, to use all its powers to their greatest extent for the abolition of the Slave Trade.

The way they went about to make this simple request was thus: "We find it *indispensably incumbent on us as a religious body*, assuredly believing that both the true temporal interest of nations, and eternal well being of individuals, depend on doing justly, loving mercy and walking humbly before God, the Creator, the Preserver, and Benefactor of men, thus to attempt to excite your attention to the affecting subject, earnestly desiring that the infinite Father of Spirits may so enrich your minds with his love and truth, and so influence your understanding by that pure wisdom which is full of mercy and good fruits, as that a sincere and impartial inquiry may take place whether it be not an essential part of the duty of your exalted station to exert upright endeavors to the full extent of your power

to remove every obstruction to public righteousness, *which the influence of artifice of particular persons governed by the narrow, mistaken views of self-interest has occasioned*, and whether, *notwithstanding such seeming impediments*, it be not in reality within your power to exercise justice and mercy, which if adhered to we cannot doubt must produce the abolition of the Slave Trade."

But even before this, this sect, so deeply, so powerfully, so irresistably impressed with "unfeigned righteousness," and, in the language of their petition, "feeling their minds animated with the ennobling principles of universal good-will to man, find a conscious dignity and felicity in the harmony and success attending the exercise of a solid uniform virtue; *short of which the warmest pretensions to public spirit, zeal for our country and rights of men, are fallacious and illusive*," presented to Congress in October, 1783, a petition of a similar character to which they allude in this petition in the following language: "*Our religious society*, in their annual assembly, on the tenth month, 1783, addressed to the then Congress, who, through the Christian rectitude of the concern, was, by the Delegates, generally acknowledged, yet not being vested with the powers of Legislation, they declined promoting any public remedy against the gross national iniquity and trafficking in the persons of fellow men." The concluding paragraph of this petition, is signed in behalf of the yearly meeting for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and the Western parts of Maryland and Virginia, held by adjournment from the twenty-eighth day of the ninth month, to the third day of the tenth month, inclusive, 1789, by Nicholas Waln, Clerk to the meeting this year."

From this it does not appear what was the number of the petitioners, but it does appear that it was the petition of a particular and peculiar religious sect, whose just abhorrence of the African Slave Trade, was the same as that of every lover of humanity, and not more; thousands and tens of thousands of American citizens had at that time as great an abhorrence of the African Slave Trade as the Quakers, but they had not, on this subject, the fanaticism and assurance of the Quakers; they did not consider themselves so much wiser and better than the rest of their fellow citizens as to take upon

themselves the liberty of telling "*a body of men chosen as eminently distinguished for wisdom, as extensive information,*"—which is the language of the Quakers to the Congress of the United States; a body chosen by the wisdom of the Legislatures of the several States and by the judgment of the people—the principles of religion and Legislation, the influence of "unfeigned righteousness" and their duties as men, Christians, and Legislators. The people of the North were a million and a half of various religious denominations, the Quaker sect constituting but a mite of that population. None of the other sects found it "indispensably incumbent on them as a religious body," to attempt to excite the attention of Congress to "the affecting subject." They knew that the "*affecting subject*" had been considered and settled in the Convention which framed the Constitution and that that settlement had been agreed to by the Convention, by Congress, and by the People; yet, notwithstanding this settlement which was made a part of the Constitution, in Article 1, Section 9, Clause 1. "The emigration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress, prior to the year 1808"—this sect so wise, so religious, so humble, so consistent, finds it indispensably incumbent on them, as a religious body, to attempt to excite the attention of Congress to "*the affecting subject,*" and as though conscious of the injustice, and absurdity of their request, they do not directly ask what they wish, but invoke "the infinite Father of Spirits to so enrich their minds, as that a sincere and impartial inquiry may take place whether it be not a part of your exalted station to remove every obstruction to public righteousness which the artifice of particular persons, governed by the narrow mistaken views of self interest have occasioned, and whether, notwithstanding such seeming impediments, it be not in reality within your power to exercise justice and mercy, which if adhered to, we cannot doubt, must produce the abolition of the Slave Trade." The plain truth is, the Quakers were in their peculiar pharasaical way, requesting the Members of Congress, in violation of their official oath, in violation of the Constitution, in violation of the agreement of the Convention which framed the Constitution, and of the Conventions which ratified it, and of

the people who delegated the members of the State Conventions ; to disregard *this* Clause of the Constitution " which the artifice of particular persons, governed by narrow and mistaken views of self interest have occasioned" and do as they, the Quakers wished, and prayed they should do.

Who were these " particular persons" of narrow mistaken views ? and what was the assembly in which their " artifice" had such a controlling influence ? These persons were Washington, Dickenson Carrol, Madison, Blunt, Butler, Rutledge, and the two Pinkneys ; these were the representatives of the South, these—according to the Quakers,—were the " particular persons governed by the narrow mistaken views of self interest !" And the assembly which their " artifice" controlled,—according to Quakerdom—was the Convention which framed the Constitution ! Rufus King, Sherman, Hamilton, Livingston, Dayton, Franklin, and the two Morriss', were the feeble minded men whom their artifice controlled !

At the same time that the Philadelphia Quakers petition was presented by Mr. Fitzsimmons, Mr. Lawrence presented an address from the Society of friends, in the City of New York, in which they set forth their desire of co-operating with *their* Southern brethren, in their protest against the Slave Trade. The parade of States in the first petition, and the introduction of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, is explained by this second petition. The Quakers of New York could then come in and claim to *co-operate* with their Southern brethren, and make the appearance of an extensive, if not a national desire for the abolition of slavery, and a parade of the number, power and influence of the apparently widely disseminated sect of Quakers. The present condition of Quakerdom speaks for itself.

The first petition called from some of the members of the House very severe remarks.

Mr. Hartly : " Moved to refer the Address to a Committee ; he thought it a mark of respect due to so numerous and respectable a part of the community."

Mr. Smith : " However respectable the petitioners may be, I hope gentlemen will consider that others equally respectable are opposed to the object which is aimed at, and are entitled to an opportunity to

be heard before the question is determined. I flatter myself gentlemen will not press the point of commitment to-day, *it being contrary to our usual mode of procedure.*"

Mr. Jackson: "Wished to know why the second reading was contended for to-day, when it was diverting the attention of members from the great object that was before the Committee of the whole? Is it because the feelings of the friends will be hurt to have their affair conducted *in the usual course of business?* Gentlemen who advocate the second reading to-day should respect the feelings of the members who represent that part of the Union, which is principally affected by the measure. I believe, Sir, that the latter class consists of as useful and as good citizens as the petitioners, men equally the friends to the revolution, and equally susceptible of the refined sensations of humanity and benevolence. Why then should such particular attention be paid to them for bringing forward a business of questionable policy? If Congress are disposed to interfere in the importation of slaves they can take the subject up without advisers, because the Constitution expressly mentions all the powers they can exercise on the subject."

Mr. Madison: "The Constitution secures to the individual States, the right of admitting the importation of Slaves into their own territory, for eighteen years, yet unexpired. The petition, *if I mistake not*, speaks of artifices used by self interested persons to carry on this trade; and *the petition from New York*, states a case that may require the consideration of Congress. It may be that foreigners take the advantage of the liberty afforded them by the American trade, to employ our shipping in the slave trade between Africa and the West Indies, when they are restrained from employing their own by restrictive laws of their nation."

Mr. Madison *was mistaken*: The petition did not speak of artifices used by self interested persons to carry on the slave trade. The language of the petition is, "artifice of particular persons governed by the *narrow mistaken policy* of self interest, has occasioned" occasioned what? "obstructions." "Obstructions to what? *"your power to exercise justice and mercy."* Mercy for what, "the abolition of the Slave Trade." Would the prohibition of foreigners from

employing American shipping in the Slave Trade between Africa and the West Indies abolish the Slave Trade, while Americans were permitted to carry it on? The petition calls these obstructions "seeming impediments." What did they impede? Why, Congress from doing as they desired them to do. The fitting out of ships in American ports for the Slave Trade, did not impede Congress, and the carrying on of that horrid traffic did not impede Congress. But Clause 1st, Sec. 9, Art. 1st of the Constitution of the United States, was not only an obstruction impediment to the power of Congress, to abolish the Slave Trade before the year 1808, but was a bond as strong as any, in that instrument, that restrained the powers of Congress. No statesman doubted the power of Congress to prohibit the Slave Trade after 1808. No constitutional obstruction or impediment to the exercise of their power to the prohibition of that traffic would then exist, and the limit of the restraint to the exercise of that power, to a definite period, implied the right to its exercise after the expiration of that period. It was not future or distant action, but action within the period in which it was prohibited by the Constitution, that the petition prayed for, as the face of the instrument itself shows.

Mr. Burk: The men in the gallery had come here to middle in a business with which they had nothing to do; they are volunteering in the cause of others, who neither expect nor desire it."

Mr. Hartly: "It is intended to bring before this House a subject of great importance to the cause of humanity; there are certain facts to be inquired into, and *the memorialists are ready to give all the information in their power; they are waiting at a great distance from their homes and wish to return.*"

Mr. Jackson: "They may as well come forward to solicit Congress to interdict the West India trade because it is injurious to the morals of mankind; from thence we import rum, which has a debasing influence upon the consumer. But Sir, is the whole morality of the United States confined to the Quakers. Are they the only people whose feelings are to be consulted on this occasion? Is it to them we owe our present happiness? Was it they who formed the

present Constitution? Did they by their arms or contributions establish our independence? I believe they were generally opposed to that measure; *why then on their application should we injure men who at the risk of their lives and fortunes secured to the community their liberty and property?* If Congress pay any uncommon degree of attention to their petition it will furnish just ground of alarm to the Southern States."

Mr. Smith: "It prays that we should take measures for the abolition of the Slave Trade. This is desiring an unconstitutional act, because the Constitution secures that trade to the States independent of Congressional restrictions for a term of twenty-one years. If, therefore, it prays for a violation of constitutional rights it ought to be rejected as an attempt upon the virtue and patriotism of the House."

Mr. Stone: "Thought the business ought to be left to take its usual course; *by the rules of the House it was expressly declared that petitions, memorials, and other papers addressed to the House should not be debated or decided on the day they were first read.*"

Mr. Baldwin: "Felt at a loss to account why precipitation was used on this occasion contrary to the customary usage of the House. He had not heard a single reason advanced in favor of it. He was afraid that there was really a little volunteering in this business, as it had been termed by the gentleman from Georgia."

Mr. Tucker: "What is the purport of the memorial? It is plainly this, to reprobate a particular kind of commerce, in a moral point of view, and to request the interposition of Congress to effect its abrogation. But Congress has no authority under the Constitution to do more than lay a duty of ten dollars upon each person imported, and this is a political consideration not arising from either religion or morality, and is the only principle upon which we can proceed to take it up. But if they will endeavor to procure the abolition of the Slave Trade, let them prefer their petitions to the State Legislatures, who alone have the power of forbidding the importation. I believe their application there would be improper; but if they are any where proper, it is there. I look upon the address

then to be ill-judged, however good the intention of the framers."

Mr. Madison: "Thought the question before the Committee was no otherwise important than as gentleman made it so by their serious opposition. Had they permitted the commitment of the memorial, as a matter of course, no notice would have been taken of it out of doors; it could never have been blown up into a decision of the question respecting the discouragement of the African Slave Trade nor alarm the owners with an apprehension that the general government were about to abolish slavery in all the States; *such things are not contemplated by any gentleman.*"

The first petition for the abolition of slavery had been that of a *religious sect*. The very next day after the presentation of it, and the New York City Quakers petition, a third petition in relation to the same subject, and from the same place, Philadelphia, the then city of Quakers, purporting to be by a number of her (Pennsylvania) citizens of *various religious demonstrations*, styled the "Pennsylvania Society for promoting the abolition of slavery." This petition was signed "Benj. Franklin, President, Philadelphia, February 3rd, 1790." The first petition concluded "in behalf of the yearly meeting for Pennsylvania, held by adjournment from 28th September to the 3rd of November, 1789." From this it would appear that the first petition had been contemplated, and actually prepared six months after the inauguration of the government, which took place April 30th, 1789, and that in February 11th, 1790, three months after its conception, it had been presented to Congress; that while the Quakers were attending in the galleries and awaiting its result, this second petition, dated the same place, and *only nine days* previous February 3rd, was presented just one day, February 12th, after the introduction of the first, praying for the very same thing. Such was the indecent haste of the Abolitionists to interfere in the affairs of the government, even before the essential business of Congress had been attended to—in a word, before the government was organized in its most important and essential departments. Whether these facts are in the language of Mr. Lincoln, "evidences of design and concert of action among its chief architects from the beginning"

to violate the plighted faith of the nation, and destroy the Constitution for the accomplishment of their purpose, I will not presume to say ; but this I will say, these efforts have been continued from that day, February 11th, 1790, to this May 22nd, 1862, when now the government is in the power of, and controlled by, the partizans of a party of the same avowed principles as those of the Abolitionists of 1790, when the armies of the *Northern or Free States*, and the armies of the *Southern or Slave States*, are arrayed in deadly hostilities to each other. When now for more than a year the devastated fields of a once peaceful and happy land have been ensanguined with fraternal blood, and desolated with all the horrors of a civil war.

After presentation of this third petition, Mr. Hartly called up the first for a second reading ; there upon it was read a second time, and moved to be committed.

Mr. Tucker : " Feared the commitment of it would be a very alarming circumstance to the Southern States, for if the object was to engage Congress in an unconstitutional measure it would be considered as an interference with their rights, the people would become very uneasy under the government and lament that they ever put additional power into their hands. *He was surprised to see another memorial on the same subject*, and that signed by a man who ought to have known the Constitution better. He thought it a mischievous attempt as respected the persons in whose favor it was intended. It would buoy them up with hopes without foundation, and as they could not reason on the subject as more enlightened men would, they might be lead to do what they would be punished for, and the owners of them in their own defence would be compelled to exercise over them a severity they were not accustomed to. Do these men expect a general emancipation of slaves by law ? *This would never be submitted to by the Southern States without a Civil War.*"

It will be observed that in these debates on the subject of slavery, it is the North pressing the South. Notice throughout, the danger is to, and the defence by the Southern States. All allusions to the object of these debates has reference to its effects upon Southern States.

observe in the above quotation the results and artifices of the Abolition of seventy-two years ago, the same as those of the Abolition of to-day, viz:—Create a *necessary* evil and then complain of it, and use it as an argument against their adversaries. Force Southern men in *self defence* to use rigid measures for the preservation of their lives, their families, and their property, and then accuse them of oppression and cruelty, and raise a hue and cry against the horrors of slavery.

The following is a model of an Abolitionist seventy-two years ago:—

Mr. Scott: “*I cannot entertain a doubt but the memorial is strictly agreeable to the Constitution. We can at present lay our hands upon a small duty of ten dollars ; I would like this, and if it is all that we can do, we must be content ; but I am sorry that the framers of the Constitution did not go further and enable us to interdict the traffic entirely ; for I look upon the Slave Trade to be one of the most abominable things on earth, and if there was neither God nor Devil, I should oppose it upon the principles of humanity and the law of nations. I cannot for my part conceive how any person can be said to acquire a property in another. The petitioners view the subject in a religious light, but I do not stand in need of religious motives to induce me to reprobate the traffic in human flesh ; other considerations weigh with me to support the commitment of the memorial and to support every constitutional measure likely to bring about its total abolition. Perhaps in our legislative capacity we can go no further than to impose a duty of ten dollars ; but I do not know how far I might go if I was one of the Judges of the United States, and those people were to come before me and claim their emancipation.*”

Here follows a model of a Fire Eater of seventy-two years ago:—

Mr. Jackson: “*Differed with the gentleman last up, and supposed the master had a qualified property in his slave. The contrary doctrine would go to the destruction of every species of personal service. The gentleman said he did not stand in need of religion to induce him to reprobate slavery ; but if he is guided by that evidence upon which the Christian system is founded he will find that*

religion is not against it. He will see from Genesis to Revelation the current setting strong that way. There never was a government on the face of the earth but what permitted slavery. The purest sons of freedom in the Grecian Republics, the citizens of Athens and Lacedemon, all held slaves. On this principle the nations of Europe are associated; it is the basis of the feudal system. But suppose all this to have been wrong. Let me ask the gentleman if it is good policy to bring forward a business at this moment, *likely to light up the flame of civil discord, for the people of the Southern States will resist one tyranny as soon as another.* The other parts of the Continent may bear them down by force of arms, but *they will never suffer themselves to be divested of their property without a struggle.* The gentleman says if he was a Federal Judge he does not know to what length he would go in emancipating these people; but I believe his judgment would be of short duration in Georgia, even the existence of such a Judge might be in danger."

Mr. Smith, (S. C.): "When we entered into this Confederacy we did it *from political, not from moral motives*, and I think my constituents do not want to learn morals from the petitioner. I do not believe they want improvement in their moral system; if they do, they can get it at home. The gentleman from Georgia has justly stated the jealousies of *the Southern States*. On entering into this government they apprehended that *the other States* not knowing the necessity the citizens of the Southern States were under of holding this species of property, would from motives of humanity and benevolence be led to vote for a general emancipation; and had they not seen that the Constitution provided against the effect of such a disposition, I may be bold to say *they never would have adopted it.* And notwithstanding all the calmness with which some gentlemen have viewed the subject, they will find that *this discussion alone will create a great alarm.* We have been told if this would be the case we ought to have avoided it by saying nothing; but it was not for that purpose that we were sent here. We look upon this measure as *an attack upon the palladium of the property of our country*; it is therefore our duty to oppose it by every means in our power. Gentlemen should consider that when *we* entered into a political con-

nection with *the other States* that this property was there ; it was acquired under a former government, conformably to the laws and Constitution, therefore any thing that will tend to deprive them of that property must be an *ex-post facto* law, and as such is forbidden by our political compact. I said *the States* would never have entered into the Confederacy unless their property had been guaranteed to them, for such is the state of agriculture in *that country* that without slaves it must be abandoned. *Why will these people, then, make use of arguments to induce the slave to turn his hand against his master ?* We labored under difficulties enough from the ravages of the late war. A gentleman can hardly come from *that country* with a servant or two, either to this place (New York) or Philadelphia, but there are persons trying to seduce his servants to leave him ; and when they have done this, the poor wretches are obliged to rob their master, in order to obtain a subsistence ; all these, therefore, who are concerned with this seduction are accessories to the robbery." Notice that these cities where these robberies were committed are the very places from which the Abolition petitions were presented to Congress, and that the same kind of thieving, practiced by Abolitionists seventy-two years ago, is still carried on in these same places by Abolitionists of the present day.

Mr. Baldwin, of Georgia, was a member of the Convention which framed the Constitution. He says : "Gentlemen who had been present at the formation of the Constitution could not avoid the recollection of the pain and difficulty which the subject caused in that body. THE MEMBERS FROM THE SOUTHERN STATES WERE SO TENDER UPON THIS POINT THAT THEY HAD WELL NIGH BROKEN UP WITHOUT COMING TO ANY DETERMINATION ; HOWEVER, FROM THE EXTREME DESIRE OF PRESERVING THE UNION AND OBTAINING AN EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT THEY WERE INDUCED MUTUALLY TO CONCEDE AND THE CONSTITUTION JEALOUSLY GUARDED WHAT THEY AGREED TO. If gentlemen look over the foot prints of that body they will find the greatest degree of caution used to imprint them so as not to be easily eradicated ; but *the moment we go to jostle on that ground, I fear we shall feel it tremble under our feet.* Congress have no power to interfere with the importation of slaves beyond what is given in the ninth Section

of the 1st Article of the Constitution ; every thing else is interdicted to them in the strongest terms. If we examine the Constitution we shall find the expressions relative to this subject cautiously expressed and more punctiliously guarded than any other part. "The migration or importation of such persons shall not be prohibited by Congress." But least this should not have secured the object sufficiently, it is declared in the same Section, "that no capitation or direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the Census ;" this was intended to prevent Congress from laying any special tax upon negro slaves, as they might in this way so burthen the possessors of them as to induce a general emancipation. If we go on to the fifth Article we shall find the first and fourth Clauses of the ninth Section of the first Article restrained from being altered before the year 1808. Gentlemen have said that this petition does not pray for an abolition of the Slave Trade. I think, Sir, it prays for nothing else, and therefore we have no more to do with it than if it prayed us to establish an order of nobility or a national religion."

Mr. Smith, (S. C.): "The *Northern States* knew that the *Southern States* had slaves before they confederated with them. If they had such an abhorrence for slavery why did they not cast us off and reject our alliance ? The truth was THE BEST INFORMED PART OF THE CITIZENS OF THE NORTHERN STATES KNEW THAT SLAVERY WAS SO ENGRAFTED INTO THE POLICY OF THE SOUTHERN STATES THAT IT COULD NOT BE ERADICATED WITHOUT TEARING UP BY THE ROOTS THEIR HAPPINESS, TRANQUILITY, AND PROSPERITY ; THAT IF IT WERE AN EVIL, IT WAS ONE FOR WHICH THERE WAS NO REMEDY, AND THEREFORE, LIKE WISE MEN THEY ACQUIESCED IT." We took each other with our mutual bad habits and respective evils, for better for worse. The Northern States adopted us with our slaves and we adopted them with their Quakers. There was then an implied compact between the Northern and Southern people that no step should be taken to injure the property of the latter, or to disturb their tranquility. It was therefore with great pain he had viewed the anxiety of some of the members to pay so uncommon respect to the memorialists, *as even to set aside the common rules of proceeding*, and attempt to commit the memorials the very day they were presented though the Southern members had solicited one day's delay,"

Mr. Smith, (S. C.): "Another objection was, that the public opinion was against slavery. How did that appear? Were there any petitions on the subject, except that from the Pennsylvania Society and a few Quakers? And were they to judge for the whole Continent? Were the citizens of the *Northern and Eastern States* to dictate to Congress on a measure in which the *Southern States* were so deeply interested? *There were no petitions against slavery from the Southern States*, and they were the only proper judges of what was for their interest."

Tuesday, March 23, 1790. "It was moved that the House should take up the report of the Committee of the whole, on the report of the Committee, to whom was referred the memorials of the people called Quakers, and of the Pennsylvania Society, for promoting the abolition of Slavery. This motion was opposed by Mr. Jackson, Mr. Smith, Mr. Burk, and Mr. Bland, they severally observed that *the discussion of the subject has already excited a spirit of dissention among the members of the House, and that every principle of policy, and concern for the dignity of the House and the peace and tranquility of the United States, concur to shew the propriety of dropping the subject and letting it sleep where it is.* On the other hand, Mr. Vining, Mr. Hartly, and Mr. Page, observed that there was the same propriety in *taking up the subject at the present moment, and bringing it to a conclusion*, as there was for first taking it up. The motion for taking up the report was warmly contested, in a lengthy debate, and finally passed in the affirmative *by a majority of one.*" That subject was not concluded to the satisfaction of the Abolitionists, and so the agitation was kept up by them from that day to this, widening and deepening the breach between the *North and the South*, and intensifying the sectional hatred and hostility of each.

The Report of the Special Committee was, "First, That the General Government is expressly restrained from prohibiting the importation of such persons, "as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, until the year 1808. Secondly, *That Congress, by a fair construction of the Constitution, are equally restrained from interfering in the emancipation of slaves, who already*

are, or who may, within the period mentioned, be imported into, or born within any of the said States. Thirdly, *That Congress have no authority to interfere in the internal Regulations of particular States*, relative to the instruction of slaves in the principles of morality and religion, * * * or to the seizure, transportation, or sale of free negroes, but have the *fullest confidence in the wisdom and humanity of the legislatures of the several States*, that they will revise their laws from time to time, when necessary, and promote the objects mentioned in the memorial, *and every other measure that may tend to the happiness of slaves."*

Such were the sentiments of men clothed with greater authority than those who framed the Constitution, and better qualified than they to represent the opinions and the wishes of the people. Several of these men had been members of the Convention, which framed the Constitution. Some of them had been not only members of that Convention, but also signers of the Declaration of Independence, and all of them were well acquainted with "the attendant history" of those instruments, and of the formation of the Government, they themselves constituting a part of it and being the first members of Congress, assembled in conformity to the Constitution. Modern politicians have lost sight of the original United States, it is there that they must search for the *reasons* of the various articles of the Constitution. They must construe them in reference to those times, those circumstances, that territory, and the views of the prominent and public men of those times, as indicative of the public sentiment. The increase of the United States to four times its original dimensions, is what has deranged the operation of the Constitution, the ideas of the people and the speculations of the politicians. Rome, bounded by the Adriatic and the Appenines, and Rome, the Mistress of the World, was not more different in regard to the circumstances and extent of territory ; than the United States, bounded by the Alleghanies, and the United States bounded by the Oceans. No Constitution that human wisdom and ingenuity can frame will be *practicable* forever. The existence of men and nations is limited, and so are the works ; besides, everything human is mutable, nothing remains permanently fixed in this world ; the changes in a peo-

ple or in the circumstances of a nation, begets the necessity of changes in the Government or in the policy of that people or that nation. The founders of the American Government—the Constitution, flattered themselves that by making the mode of amending the Constitution, a part of that instrument, they had founded a government in which necessary changes would be made conformably to that mode; and that thus they had made a kind of perpetual government; yet such were the caution in the consideration of amendments by the House, and the apprehension of the results of such consideration, entertained by members of the first Congress, that, in the language of Mr. Ames, they feared “*this public discussion would be like a dissection of the Constitution; it would be defacing its symmetry, laying bare its sinews and tendons, ripping up the whole form and tearing out its vitals;*” and the very first act of a portion of the people, and members of the first Congress, under the Constitution, was to violate it. One of the most important changes produced by the enlargement of the original area of the United States is the relation of the Northern or Free States to the Southern or Slave States. The relation which was considered permanent by the founders of the government, was in the original area 14 Northern States to 10 Southern, a total of 24 States and 48 Senators; two-thirds of the Senate would be 32; and three-fourths of the States 18; so that neither the North nor the South could propose or make any amendment, or carry any measure of vital importance without the concurrence of the other. The increased number of States, from the enlarged area of the original domain, has changed this relation, and will continue to increase the disparity between the Northern and Southern States, until soon the Northern States will be able to propose and make amendments, and carry any important measure without the concurrence of any of the Southern States. To correctly comprehend what I have stated, it is only necessary to understand that the principle of the Black Republican party is to admit no more Slave States into the Union; and that there is territory enough for 28 more States of 50,000 square miles each, allowing this dimension to the Free States that already exist west of the Mississippi river; thus would the relation of the two sections of the Union ultimately become 46 Free States to 15

Slave States, even supposing that the present border Slave States, should remain such.

The United States have progressed in power, improvement, and prosperity, unparalleled in the annals of mankind. The prevalence of Black Republican principles has stopped that progress and improvement, and enfeebled that power, and the ultimate destiny of the South, and of the Union, under the dominion of the Black Republican dynasty, is apparent imminent and inevitable, for, where power exists without either wisdom or virtue, all constitutional restraints are but as mere cobwebs in the way of fanaticism and ambition; and the noblest political edifice ever erected by the genius of man, exhausted of its wisdom, its virtue, and its patriotism, must crumble into chaos, amid the career of cruelty, wickedness, folly, fanaticism, ignorance, and imbecility.

ERRATA

- Page 13, Line 23, resorted to accomplish read resorted to, to accomplish.
- " 15, " 17, demigog read demigod.
- " 17, " 25, confirming read confirming.
- " 22, " 3, an read as.
- " 25, " 24, and read not.
- " 27, " 27, and the citizens read and of the citizens.
- " 29, " 25, hand read hand.
- " 30, " 8, At read " At.
- " 31, " 24, hence read whence.
- " 31, " 26, demanded read demanded"
- " 32, " 13, security read security."
- " 36, " 28, Republic read Republican.
- " 40, " 5, The sentence should be: Three of these States, one free and two slave, were admitted during the administration of Washington, who recommended the admission of the first Slave State ever admitted into the Union; the remaining States, free and Slave, &c.
- " 42, " 13, impractability read impracticability.
- " 42, " 17, practability read practicability.
- " 43, " 6, them read their.
- " 44, " 29, Northern read Southern.
- " 45, " 17, these read those.
- " 45, " 18, these read those.
- " 45, " 31, Southern read Northern.
- " 48, " 34, settling read setting.
- " 50, " 2, in read on.
- " 51, " 5, agreed read argued.